The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

LIBRARY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

W T Moore

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/chistianquarterl0001unse

BR
1
CS
V.1

THE

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

VOL. I.

JAN.—OCT., 1869.

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε· τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.—1 THESS. v, 21.

EDITOR.

W. T. MOORE,

PASTOR OF CHURCH OF CHRIST, WALNUT-STREET, CINCINNATI.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

W. K. PENDLETON,
President of Bethany College, West Virginia.

ISAAC ERRETT,
President of Alliance College, Ohio.

ROBERT GRAHAM,
Presid't of College of Arts in Kentucky Univ'y.

DR. S. E. SHEPARD,
Of Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio.

THOMAS MUNNELL,
Cor. Sec'y of Amer. Chris. Missionary Society.

ALEXANDER PROCTER,
Pastor of Church of Christ, Independence, Mo.

CINCINNATI:

R. W. CARROLL & CO., PUBLISHERS,

115 AND 117 WEST FOURTH-STREET.

1869.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1869,

BY R. W. CARROLL & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

CONTENTS.

JANUARY.

			PAGE
I.	MODERN PREACHERS AND PREACHING,	*W. T. Moore.*	1
II.	THE FELLOWSHIP,	*Isaac Errett.*	22
III.	AN INFALLIBLE CHURCH, OR AN INFALLIBLE BOOK—WHICH?	*David Walk.*	38
IV.	RELIGION AND SCIENCE,	*B. A. Hinsdale.*	54
V.	INDIFFERENCE TO THINGS INDIFFERENT,	*Thomas Munnell.*	75
VI.	THE SECRET OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SUCCESS,	*J. S. Lamar.*	89
VII.	THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS—HOW CAN IT BE ACCOMPLISHED?	*W. T. Moore.*	100
VIII.	THE UNION MOVEMENT—WHAT WILL COME OF IT?	*Thomas Munnell.*	111
IX.	BISHOP—OVERSEERS,	*S. E. Shepard.*	117
	LITERARY NOTICES,		123

1. First Principles of Popular Education and Public Instruction—2. The New Testament History, with an Introduction, connecting the History of the Old and New Testaments—3. An Exposition and Defense of the Scheme of Redemption, as it is Revealed and Taught in the Holy Scriptures—4. Poems by Jean Ingelow—5. Where is the City?—6. Seekers after God—7. A Book about Dominies—8. Over the River—9. Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms.

Foreign Literature, 133.—10. Friederich Schleiermacher—11. R. Rothe's Nachgelassene Predigten—12. Geschichte des Zeitalters der Reformation, 1517–1648—13. Natürliche Schöpfungs-Geshichte—14. Novum Testamentum Græce, Ex Sinaitico Codice omnium antiquissimo, Vaticana itemque Elizeviriana lectione notata Editit Ænoth.

Reviews and Magazines, 140.—1. Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie and Kirche—2. Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie—3. Der Katholik—4. Revue Chrétienne—5. The British Quarterly Review—6. The London Quarterly Review—7. The British and Foreign Evangelical Review—8. The Contemporary Review.

EDITORS' ROUND TABLE, ... 143

APRIL.

I.	GALILEO AND THE CHURCH,	*B. A. Hinsdale.*	145
II.	PHASES OF RELIGION IN THE UNITED STATES,	*J. F. Rowe.*	177
III.	THE GLORIES OF MARY,	*J. S. Lamar.*	194
IV.	THE ROYAL PRIESTHOOD,	*John A. Brooks.*	205
V.	CHRISTOLOGY,	*Robert Graham.*	219
VI.	THE KINGDOM OF GOD,	*Benjamin Franklin.*	237
VII.	CHURCH OFFICERS,	*S. E. Shepard.*	251
	LITERARY NOTICES,		257

1. The History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire—2. The New Testament, translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf—3. The Opium Habit, with Suggestions as to the Remedy—4. The Letters of Madame de Sevigne to her Daughter and Friends; the Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu—5. The Earthly Paradise: A Poem—6. Search after Truth: addressed to Young Men—7. The Gates Ajar—8. Providence and Life: Select Sermons preached in the Broadway Church, New York—9. Theological Discussion, held at Des Moines, June 22, 1868.

PAGE

Foreign Literature, 271.—10. Meister Eckhart, der Mystiker—11. Israel und die Kirche—12. Evangelischer Kalender—13. Deutsches Woerterbuch—14. Juedisches Handwerkerleben zur zeit Jesu.
Reviews and Magazines, 277.—1. Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie—2. Der Katholik—3. Revue Chrétienne—4. Waarheid in Liefde—Theologische studien und Kritiken—6. Theologischer Jahresbericht—7. Unsere Zeit.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE, ... 284
EDITORS' ROUND TABLE, ... 288

JULY.

I. THE FAILURE OF PROTESTANTISM, . . . *Isaac Errett.* . . 289
II. THE LIVING ISSUE, ... *Alexander Procter.* . 307
III. THE HARMONY OF THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE, . *R. Milligan.* . . 319
IV. THE SPIRIT OF ROMANISM, ... *J. S. Lamar.* . . 338
V. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN BAPTISM AND THE REMISSION OF SINS, ... *W. K. Pendleton.* . 356
VI. THE LINE OF LIFE, ... *Thomas Munnell.* . 383
VII. MYSTICAL OR TRANSCENDENTAL SKEPTICISM AND WOMAN'S RIGHTS, ... *B. U. Watkins.* . . 395
VIII. APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, ... *S. E. Shepard.* . 403
LITERARY NOTICES, ... 407

1. Chips from a German Workshop—2. Poems by Lucy Larcom—3. By-Ways of Europe—4. The New West; or, California in 1867-68—5. Tablets—6. Reminiscences of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy—7. Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms—8. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul—9. The Land and its Story; or, the Sacred Historical Geography of Palestine—10. Night Scenes in the Bible—11. Debate on Baptism and Kindred Subjects.
Foreign Literature, 420.—12. Galilée, les droits de la science et la méthode des sciences physiques. Galilée, son procès, sa condemnation d'après des documents inédits. Galilée, sa vie, des découvertes et ses travaux—13. Johannes Kepler. Nikolaus Kopernikus und Martin Luther—14. Pythagoras der Weise von Samos—15. Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk.
Reviews and Magazines, 428.—1. Revue Chretiénne—2. Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie—3. Theologischer Jahresbericht—4. Theologische Studien und Kritiken—5. Allgemaine Kirchenzeitung.

OCTOBER.

I. THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE, ... *W. T. Moore.* . 433
II. LIFE AND TIMES OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, . *J. F. Rowe.* . . 456
III. ANCIENT HYMNODY, ... *James Challen.* . . 477
IV. ECUMENICAL COUNCILS, ... *B. A. Hinsdale.* . . 491
V. WOMAN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH, ... *Thomas Munnell.* . 508
VI. JERUSALEM, ... *A. N. Gilbert.* . . 523
LITERARY NOTICES, ... 543

1. Pre-Historic Nations—2. Our New Way round the World—3. The Queen of the Air—4. Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets—5. Studies of Philosophy and Theology—6. The Life of John James Audubon, the Naturalist—7. Sermons by Rev. Thomas House Taylor, D. D.—8. Cyclopœdia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature—9. Credo—10. Realities of Irish Life—11. David, the King of Israel—12. Closing Scenes of the Life of Christ—13. The Gates Wide Open—14. Sacred and Constructive Art; its Origin and Progress—15. The Wonders of Optics. Thunder and Lightning. The Phenomena and Laws of Heat—16. The Bible Hand-Book—17. An American Woman in Europe—18. Men, Women, and Ghosts.
Foreign Literature, 558.—19. Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Deutschland—20. Sprache ünd Schrift; Die Sprache und ihr Leben—21. R. Rothe's Nachgelassene Predigten—22. Vorträge—23. Siphre Kodesh.
Reviews and Magazines, 569.—1. Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie—2. Revue Chrétienne—3. The British Quarterly Review.

EDITORS' ROUND TABLE, ... 571

THE

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1869.

I.—MODERN PREACHERS AND PREACHING.

Gleanings Among the Sheaves. By REV. C. H. SPURGEON. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1869.

The Gospel Preacher: A Book of Twenty Sermons. By BENJAMIN FRANKLIN. Cincinnati: Franklin & Rice, Publishers. 1869.

Nature and Life. Sermons by ROBERT COLLYER. Boston: Horace B. Fuller. 1867.

Thoughts on Personal Religion; Being a Treatise on the Christian Life in its Two Chief Elements—Devotion and Practice. Fourth American Edition, enlarged. By REV. EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1869.

Sermons by HENRY WARD BEECHER. Selected from Published and Unpublished Discourses. In Two Volumes. Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1868.

IF Dominie Sampson had lived in our days he might have "wagged his pow in a pulpit" after all. There are now so many guides to the Divinity student, so many helps to aid "stickit ministers" over the theological fence, that it is difficult to conceive how any one can fail to get on cleverly as a preacher of the Gospel, though he should have scarcely a qualification for his work.

This is decidedly a manufacturing age. And why not manufacture ministers of the Gospel as well as any thing else? There is certainly as much demand for them as for any other article of either home or foreign consumption. The harvest is truly great, and the laborers are few. Hence, if the thing can be done, that is, if ministers *can be made to order,* to supply the pressing need of the age,

we do not see any reason why we should hesitate for a moment in giving aid and comfort to any manufacturing establishment that will give good promise of success in this business.

But it may be a question whether the thing can be done "*ab initio*;" and this is the first question that must be settled in order to come to any just conclusion in reference to ministerial education. And we do not raise this question because we suppose any one who has seriously reflected upon the subject, and who is sufficiently informed to understand the subject, will conclude that an efficient ministry is a thing that can be manufactured to order; but in this utilitarian age, when machinery is used for almost every thing, when the rattle of wheels is the index of power, and the dimensions of a library the measure of mental aptitude, it becomes us to be careful, lest we contaminate the most sacred of all callings with the spirit of mechanism, which, in a large sense, is the ruling spirit of the age.

During the first half of the present century, the question as to what constitutes a Divine call to the ministry was very fully and ably discussed, both in this country and Europe. The beginning of the nineteenth century was the turning point, in religious thought, from a semi-mysticism to more rational and consistent views of the Bible. The danger now is that we may go too far; may reach the opposite extreme of mysticism—rationalism or materialism. And in the present very earnest and commendable effort to provide the Churches with an educated ministry, this is the point to be guarded. We must not lose sight of the fact that every true minister of the Gospel must have some special qualifications for his work, which none of the colleges in the land can confer upon him. Let us, then, inquire what these qualifications are.

1. He must have a reasonable amount of native intellectual force. We know that it is a favorite idea with some that all men are equal in *natural* intellectual endowments, and that the difference in men is accounted for by the difference in their education. But this view of the matter is not seriously entertained by any considerable portion of thinking people; for it would be just as reasonable to say that the difference in physical development is dependent upon the difference in the food eaten during the period of growth. But every one knows that this is not true, for children who eat the same kind of food have often very different physical developments. Hence, we

insist upon it that there is a very great difference in the *natural* mental endowments of men, and that a man who enters upon the work of the ministry should give evidence that he has some natural qualifications for his work. We wish to emphasize the word *natural*, for some have supposed that there is a war between nature and the Gospel, and that a man, to be a successful minister of the Gospel, must have his nature so changed that he will be *unnatural* in all that he says and does. This, we think, is a great mistake. The Gospel does not make war upon nature. It is a perversion of nature that the Gospel finds fault with, and seeks to remedy. And, all other things being equal, the man who is most natural in his manner of preaching the Gospel will always be most successful. The day of supernatural endowments, in the miraculous sense, is past. We do not say, however, that the preacher does not receive Divine assistance; on the contrary, we affirm that the faithful minister does receive such assistance, and without this would essentially fail; but what we mean is, that this assistance is not such as to endow him with special gifts, such as the proclaimers of the Gospel had during the Apostolic ministry. Hence, we conclude that the minister of the Gospel who would be successful in winning souls to Christ must have some natural qualifications for his work—must give evidence that he possesses the intellectual and physical endowments necessary to give him power before the people.

2. He must have the highest moral qualifications. We care not what may be his mental and physical capabilities, he can not do the work of God without moral fitness. True, a man who is wholly destitute of moral character may, for a while, by superior tact and intellectual force, keep himself before the people, as a minister of the Gospel, and meet with a certain degree of success. It does not follow that the Gospel is not "the power of God unto salvation," because the man who proclaims it is destitute of a moral character. Men may preach the Gospel through very unworthy motives; but if the Gospel is preached, no matter who proclaims it, it is the good seed of the Kingdom, and will bring forth, more or less, good fruit. But the work of the faithful minister is only partially complete when he has announced "the glad tidings of great joy" to the people. Those converted must now be gathered into a Church, properly organized, and instructed in the Divine life. And just here is where

the unworthy minister will fail—signally fail—for he must "show himself a pattern in all things;" and if he be destitute of moral rectitude, if his work in the ministry is prompted by sinister motives, his hypocrisy will become manifest, sooner or later, whenever he begins to work out the problem of Church organization and spiritual growth. Hence, in order to any permanent success, the minister of the Gospel must have the highest moral fitness for his work. But this is by no means the only thing necessary. As a righteous life is such an essential matter, it has too frequently been made the only necessary qualification. And hence, men have frequently been selected and urged to enter the ministry who had not a single qualification except that they were good men; that is, they were good in the sense that they did not do any thing *positively wrong*, and yet it would be difficult to find wherein they ever did any thing *positively good.* Such men are simply *negative* men, and can never be effective agents in carrying the Gospel, through the struggle and conflict which they must necessarily meet, to a lost and ruined world. In a certain sense, men may be so good as to be *good for nothing*, but this is not the character who will become a living impersonification of the great aggressive power which is to work out the world's redemption from sin. Nothing short of a character full of *positive* elements can be reasonably successful in the propagation of the Gospel. Hence, it is the weakness and shame of the ministry of the present day that it is largely composed of men whose qualifications are confined to a single element, rather than to the many that enter into ministerial character. We forget that while goodness is essential to the character of a true minister, it does not follow, because a man has goodness, that, therefore, he is qualified for the work of the ministry. We should be careful not to single out one attribute and give it an undue prominence, when there are others of equal importance that should be considered in determining ministerial qualifications. By properly discriminating at this point, we may, in the future, avoid the reproach which has so long rested upon the ministry; namely, when a man is found to be unfit for any thing else, *it is supposed to be good evidence that he is called to preach the Gospel.* This will never do. God wants the best sacrifices, "the firstlings of the flock," and hence, the very best talent in all the land should be consecrated to the ministry of the Word.

3. No young man should enter upon the work of the ministry who does not feel compelled to do so by an irresistible conviction of duty. He should feel as Paul did: "Woe be to me if I preach not the Gospel." A young man approached an old preacher once and said to him, "I have been thinking of giving myself to the work of the ministry; would you advise me to do it?" The old man answered, "*Not if you can help it.*" This cracks the shell and exposes the kernel of the whole matter. If a young man can keep from entering the ministry, he had better not enter. We mean by this that if he can keep from it without violating his most decided and earnest convictions of duty, he had better not begin a work in which he is almost sure to fail. And when we use the word fail, we do not mean that he will not be able to do any thing, but that he will fail in the true measure of the great work to which he has given himself.

Earnest convictions are essential to any work that requires labor and struggle. It was this that made Napoleon the First the unconquerable hero that he was. He believed that he had a mission, that he was the "man of destiny," and that nothing could successfully resist him in his efforts to carry out his plans. So of all the successful men who have ever lived. They have been men of intense earnest convictions, and have gone forward in their work with a zeal and energy which knew no defeat. Shall we ignore all the facts of history in the selection of men to proclaim the Gospel of the grace of God? Shall we be satisfied with the non-committal utterances of candidates for the ministry, who express no deeper conviction of duty than is manifest in the shilly-shally, namby-pamby, lackadaisical style in which they speak of the great work upon which they propose to enter? We must get away from this timid irresolution; this "masterly inactivity;" this doubting hesitancy; this form of godliness without the power. Young men who bear the standard of the Cross to the nations must feel that the highest obligations of life, time, and eternity impel them to the work. They must feel that the work can not be done unless they do it, and that they can not fail in what is proposed, for the "everlasting arms" will be around them, protecting them from all danger; while their ever-blessed and exalted leader will conduct them to glorious and certain victory.

One of the most powerful elements in Spurgeon's character is, that he believes in his mission. He believes that he has been called to do a special work—a work that no other man can do. Hence, he does not go about his business in a trembling, halting, hesitating manner; but whatever his hands find to do he does with all his might. The very moment he comes before the people, you are impressed with the sublime faith which he exercises in his mission. He believes that God has called him to the work of preaching the Gospel, and that, therefore, he can not fail in the accomplishment of great results. He comes before the people *in the name of Christ*, speaks in the name of Christ, asks sinners, in the name of Christ, to obey the Gospel and be saved. Such preaching goes forth with the seal of *authority* on it, and the effect is just what might be reasonably expected—thousands are converted who otherwise would have regarded the Story of the Cross with perfect indifference.

While the Gospel is a Divine message—a message from God—we must never lose sight of the fact that it is intended for *men*, and that it is to be preached *by* men *to* men. The scheme of redemption places the ministry next to Christ. In the proclamation of the Gospel the minister stands between Christ and the people. And certainly no one should occupy such a place unless he is fully persuaded that he has a special call to it. And we mean by this an overwhelming conviction of duty to preach the Gospel; not the sights and sounds of a mythical theology, or the wild experiences of an unlettered superstition.

We have already intimated that in getting away from Babylon we are in great danger of passing by Jerusalem; that is, in coming out of the smoke of mediæval mysticism, it is possible for us to go to the extreme of a cold, lifeless rationalism. And there is nothing, perhaps, in which we are more liable to practically exemplify this evil than in the type and character of the ministry.

From the foregoing considerations it will be seen that there are some questions which lie back of the actual education of a candidate for the ministry, which must be satisfactorily settled before his education should be considered at all. If he is found to be seriously defective in the qualifications mentioned, all hope should at once be given up as to his ever becoming an effective and successful preacher of the Gospel; and the sooner his attention is turned to something

else, the better it will be for both him and the cause of Christ. It was never intended that all men should preach. And, as we have heretofore only partially recognized this fact in the selection of men for the ministry, we need not be astonished because we now find hundreds of men in the ministry who have very few qualifications for such a calling. Hence, the first great crying want of the ministry to-day is, *a proper selection of men to be educated for the work.*

But the education of these men is a matter of scarcely less importance than their selection. A young man may have all the qualifications to which we have alluded, and yet be completely ruined as an effective preacher by the education he receives. There is no class of men who need education more than ministers of the Gospel; and it may be just as safely affirmed, that there is no class of men whose education is so sadly defective in the essential matters as our modern preachers. Theological seminaries are the mills in which they are ground out. A young man must go through the curriculum of study, no matter what his peculiar talents are. Every one must fare precisely alike, though there should be a difference the width of the poles in tastes, feelings, talents, opportunities, and purposes. Parents do not act so silly in the management of their children at home. They study the peculiar dispositions and circumstances of every one, and seek to make the education correspond to these conditions. In other words, they do not treat all precisely alike—but take into consideration the tastes, habits, purposes, etc., and then aim to make the education accord with these. So should it be in the education of men for the ministry. There should always be a careful consideration of the circumstances, etc., of the candidate, and the education made to conform to these.

It is impossible, as well as altogether unnecessary, to give all who desire to enter the ministry a regular collegiate education. Some of the most efficient preachers of the present day are men who never, in their lives, received an hour's instruction in a college. And again, some who have attended college, and received a college diploma, can lay little claim to scholastic attainments. They have been simply workers, and have had no time, and perhaps less taste, for scholarly achievements. They have been deeply impressed with the *pressing needs of the hour*, and have not given the questions of polished rhetoric, profound erudition, and oratorical display, very much of their

thoughts. Life has been to them too earnest a thing, and the great responsibilities resting on them entirely too heavy, to engage in such pursuits as can yield abundant fruit to only a few.

Nor is it necessary that men should be trained in a Theological college before they are competent to preach the Gospel. Doubtless many brave and earnest hearts have been deterred from entering the ministry because they did not feel equal to the task of passing the review of the professors. They were fully persuaded that they could work for *God*, but they were not so well convinced that they could do the work which *men* required of them.

Thus Theological colleges have worked evil in two ways: first, by creating the idea in the minds of the people that the education of preachers is a sort of manufacturing process, and hence, encouraging a great many young men to enter the ministry who are wholly incompetent for the work; and, secondly, by discouraging a great many who are competent, but who are kept out of the work by the rigid requirements of college professors.

But are we to conclude, because Theological colleges have worked evil, that, therefore, we should have no colleges at all for the education of young men for the ministry? We should not be hasty in coming to such a conclusion. Because there is danger of making these colleges instruments of evil, this is not positive evidence that they should be abandoned entirely. There is danger in almost every thing. It is even a fearful thing to live; but it would surely be very foolish for every body to commit suicide on this account. The wiser course would certainly be to make a good use of life, which will at once largely overcome the danger of living. So with reference to schools for ministerial education. They should not be abandoned because there is danger in them, unless it can be shown that this danger is greater than the amount of good which can possibly come out of them. But this, we are convinced, can not be done. Hence, we should have these schools, but we should be careful to guard them from the flagrant abuses which have so long characterized the management of such institutions.

Having now briefly noticed the manufacturing process, by which preachers are made, we are somewhat prepared to examine critically the product of this process; and hence, we will proceed to consider the ministry as it actually exists to-day.

The ministry is now in a transition state, or, to speak chemically, it is in a state of decomposition. It is rapidly passing out of its old scholastic shell, and taking on new and more active characteristics. It is not so much a study—a thing of the closet—as it was in former years; but it is more of a life—a thing in terrible and earnest conflict with the world. And in this respect it has certainly gained immensely in power. But energies must be properly directed in order to be effective for the good of the world. A locomotive turned loose upon a railroad track, without some one to guide it, may do a great deal of harm. Energy must have intelligence; and this is one of the difficulties with the ministry of modern times. We do not mean that it has not intelligence, in the general sense of that word, but, in the special business to which it is called—the preaching of the Gospel—it is sadly deficient in knowledge. Literature and science are well enough, so far as they go; and it should be the aim of every respectably educated preacher to be as familiar with these as possible, but they can never make him a preacher, nor fit him for the great work of feeding the flock of God. He must draw his knowledge and inspiration from divine sources, for nothing else will enable him to make his work thorough and permanent.

While reading the sermons of Barrow, Jeremy Taylor, and preachers of their class, we wonder that the people could have patience to listen to such long dissertations, so elaborately and learnedly wrought. But we are compelled, after all, to admit that their sermons are far more preferable than many of our half-hour pulpit exhibitions of the present time; for these might be frequently, not inappropriately, called exhibitions of mental weakness in the uninteresting attribute of leanness. The old masters always had something to say, something which bore evidence that it had been dug up from the mines of thought, had passed through the refining process of reflection; and, though bristling with dogmatics, and almost stifled with erudition, the *matter* of these discourses would be an excellent substitute for the "airy nothings," for the "*vox et præterea nihil*"—panegyrics of modern pulpit oratory. Earle, in his "Microcosmography," has so wittily and vividly drawn the portraiture of this modern clerical humbug, that we can not do better than quote his own description:

"The labor of his sermon is chiefly in his lungs; and the only thing he has made in it himself is the *faces*. His action is all passion, and his speech

interjections. He will not draw his handkerchief out of his place, nor blow his nose without discretion. His commendation is, that he never looks upon book, and, indeed, he *was never used to it.*"*

Of course we do not include even a majority of our modern preachers in this description; for we are strongly of the opinion that the ministry of to-day, as a whole, is an improvement on the ministry of the scholastic period, or even the times of Jeremy Taylor. What it has lost in learning it has gained in activity and adaptation to the real necessities of the hour. But it has much yet to gain every way before it will be equal to the great task of converting the world.

We now come to consider the subject of preaching in the light of the Holy Scriptures, and in view of the wants of the present age. And for the sake of perspicuity as well as order, we will examine, first, the *matter*, and, second, the *manner* of pulpit discourse.

1. We have already hinted that the modern pulpit has lost substance when compared with the pulpit of even a century ago. Nor is it very certain that it has gained much in the *character* of the substance of discourse. True, it does not deal so much in theology; but is this deficiency made up by greater attention to Christology? If so, then we are clearly advancing in the right direction, for the first and greatest need of the pulpit is, a clear and more earnest exhibition of Christ in his character and work as the "chief among ten thousand, and as the one altogether lovely." In this respect Mr. Spurgeon is setting the ministry a good example. While he started out with many excellent improvements on the cold formalism of the English pulpit, he has himself made wonderful progress toward the divine idea of preaching. His first sermons were strongly tinctured with hyper-calvinism, and not unfrequently some of his best efforts were greatly impaired by watering them with streams flowing from the mountains of "free-will and necessity." But more recently his preaching has been confined more exclusively to the exhibition of Christ, and him crucified. And, in this respect, he is certainly approaching the true idea of preaching. What we all desire to know most, is Christ *himself;* Christ, "the man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;" Christ, the sorrowing one of Gethsemane; Christ, the suffering one of Calvary; Christ, who lay in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea; Christ, who burst the bars of death, and triumphed over

*Earle's "Microcosmography," p. 7.

the grave; Christ, who ascended upon high and led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men; Christ, the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end; Christ, who is our "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption;" Christ, who "was dead, but is alive for evermore." This is the theme for the pulpit; this is the only theme that will electrify the people—make them feel the need of a new life and a new hope, and inspire them with holy ambition for a better and more glorious state of existence. Here is where our modern pulpit is sadly defective. We have too much science and not enough of Jesus, the sinner's friend; too many lectures on literature, and not enough of Christ crucified, as the power of God and wisdom of God; too many anecdotes, intended simply to catch the public attention and gain the public applause, and not enough of the story of the Cross, the most wonderful that ever was recorded in the languages of earth. We think, then, that the current preaching of our time would gain greatly in vitality and force if it would give us more of the *personal life of Him* who is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," and who "ever lives to make intercession for us." We do not undervalue doctrinal preaching. We think this can not be safely dispensed with. In this age of intense activity, religious thought should preserve some consistency, else we will soon pass into a sort of religious anarchy, which is certain spiritual death. But our doctrine should receive its vitality, strength, and authority from Him who is the "Way, the Truth, and the Life." The following, from Mr. Spurgeon, is in the right style:

"A view of Christ is always beneficial to a Christian—too much of Christ we can not have—there can be no tautology where his name is mentioned. Give us Christ always, Christ ever. The monotony of Christ is sweet variety; and even the unity of Christ hath in it all the elements of harmony. Christ on his cross and on his throne, in the manger and in the tomb—Christ every-where, is sweet to us. We love his name, we adore his person; we delight to hear of his works—the theme is ever new.

"There are some who complain that their love to the Savior is faint and cold. But this would not be if they were more with Jesus. The closer you live to Christ, and the more you know him, the better you will love him. Do not try to produce in yourself a certain degree of love to Christ by some extraordinary means, but go into his presence, meditate upon him continually, picture to yourself his sufferings for you, and then you will love him—it will become easy to you, for *he* will draw your poor heart closer to himself as you thus think about him; and your love to him will grow just in proportion as you realize his love to you."

2. The preaching of the present time should be characterized by a more profound knowledge of the teachings of the Word of God. On this subject we find some remarks in the *North British Review* of 1866, so appropriate, and withal so forcible, that we prefer to give the writer's thoughts in his own language:

"Nothing, we are persuaded, has of late contributed more to redeem the preaching of the age, both from intellectual and spiritual commonplace, than the great development, in our day, of a healthy exegetical spirit. The study of divine truth has been resolving itself more and more into the study of the divine Word. Men have been seeking to make their escape from the narrowness and poverty of man's thoughts and words, to the largeness and fullness of the thoughts and words of God. This is, unquestionably, a movement in the right direction. As the reformation of a philosophy was based on the interpretation of nature, so, surely, must the reformation and revivification of theology and preaching be based on the interpretation of Scripture. If system and theory be valuable in their own place, that place is assuredly one subordinate to, and dependent on, interpretation. System must grow out of interpretation, not interpretation out of system. Divine words must be questioned, even as natural facts must be questioned—not merely summoned as 'proof-texts,' to establish a conclusion already foregone."

While we agree with this writer in the necessity of the thing for which he contends, we doubt very much whether the tendency of the ministry is in this direction. That a great many preachers are turning away from the dead systems of the past to the Living Word, can not be denied. In fact, we hail this as one of the favorable indications of the times, and rejoice in the prospect which it promises. It is, however, a sad fact that a large portion of the ministry has not yet adopted the short, but comprehensive motto, "Hear the Word." They are willing to hear almost every thing else. Hence, they say, "Hear the Church," "Hear science," "Hear literature," "Hear history," "Hear human experience," while "the Word of God, which lives and abides forever," and which alone can infallibly speak the things that will enlighten the understanding of men, and guide them in the path of life everlasting, is, in a great measure, silenced amid the din and cry of these human voices.

All true and living preaching must draw its inspiration from the Living Oracles—must be pregnant with the seed of the Kingdom. Nothing else will feed the soul with that "bread which cometh down from Heaven." The faithful preacher must take his message directly from his Master, and he will learn to preach more and more like Christ as he ponders and deeply studies the words of Christ. A

man of ordinary mental capacity, who relies upon the Holy Scriptures as the source of his wisdom, will be able to preach most effectively, where a much more intellectual man, who relies upon other instrumentalities than the Word of God, will signally fail. Hence, we conclude, that our preachers need to rely more upon exegesis, more upon a thorough and comprehensive presentation of the teachings of the Word of God.*

Of the exegetical class of preachers, (a class which we hope to see greatly augmented,) Mr. Franklin is, in some respects, a good type. His thoughts are often slovenly expressed, but there is in all that he says such a reverence for the Bible, such a manifest desire to know what the will of God is, that you are very willing to forgive any rhetorical defects or ungrammatical sentences. He has the power of making himself understood, and that is the chief matter, after all, when dealing with immortal souls. The following, from a sermon on "The Adaptation of the Bible to Man," and selected almost at random, will serve to show his manner of speaking, as well as the sources of knowledge on which he relies:

"The law of Moses was not a universal law; not for all the world, but for the nation of Israel. The New Testament is adapted to and designed for all the world. It is not simply a book for the Church, for 'us,' 'our brethren,' 'our Church,' but for *the world.* The world is mainly in three divisions: The unbelieving, the believing who are not Christians—not in Christ—and those in Christ. For these three classes the New Testament has also three divisions: The four records of testimony concerning Christ by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These are not, as many style them, 'four Gospels,' nor 'the four Gospels,' but four records of testimony concerning the Messiah, written by four different men. These records are all of the same nature—all on the same subject, and evidently all have the same design. When we get the design of one of them, we have the design of all. John, the last one, as arranged in the volume called the 'New Testament,' and the one last written, informs us what the design was. John xx, 30, 31. He says: 'Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life through his

*Men go on perseveringly plowing the old ruts, mistaking dead dogmas for living truths, human artificial forms for the Divine substance. We do not object, as we have already fully shown, to doctrinal preaching, but only to the kind of doctrinal preaching which is still too largely prevalent. It is not doctrine, but *mere* doctrine, hard and stiff doctrine, narrow, one-sided doctrine—doctrine divorced from Scripture exegesis, divorced from experience, divorced from human life—doctrine that may be carried about in a formula, and passed, without thought, or feeling, or heart-conviction, from hand to hand. We want water, drawn not from mere human tanks—whether of Oxford, or Geneva, or Westminster—but from the Divine, living springs.—*North British Review.*

name.' No man can state his purpose, in writing a book, more clearly than this writer does here; and, as before stated, in doing so he also states the purpose of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. That design is, *that the reader may believe 'that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.'* Whatever else the reader may find in these records, he should constantly bear in mind that the leading design is, that *he may believe.* These records of testimony are not to prove any doctrine or creed in the world, but to lay before the reader the evidence concerning Jesus, the anointed Son of God, that he may believe.

"Such being the purpose of these records, how appropriate it is that they should appear first in the volume! In this, too, this book proves its adaptation to the world as no other book in the world does. The department for the unbeliever meets his eye first, and he finds it adapted to him and prepared for him. The books that men have made have left out this grand department entirely, and passed by the unbelieving, making no provision for them. The creed-makers have been so busily engaged in distinguishing their opinions from those differing from them, that they appear to have overlooked and passed by the unbelieving part of mankind. In the Lord's book special provision is made for them, and it is the first thing. In making a believer there must be two things: 1. Something to believe; 2. Credible testimony, bringing that something to the human understanding. In the case in hand, the Lord has furnished that which is to be believed—the truth concerning Jesus, that *he is the Christ, the Son of the living God.* This truth is not always found in precisely the same form or the same words, but always amounting to the same. As the Lord stood on the banks of the Jordan, the Almighty Father embodied it in the following words: 'This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased.' In the mountain of Transfiguration this was repeated, and the following added: 'Hear you him.' As in the brief but all-important confession made by Peter, (Matt. xvi, 16,) it reads as follows: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' 'On this,' the Lord says, 'I will build my Church,' or, 'on this rock.' This is a very perspicuous statement of the central idea of Christ's religion, the transcendently important truth, to be believed. It is not, Thou art Christ, or Anointed—for others had been anointed—but thou art *the* anointed—in a much higher sense than any other had ever been. It is not 'Son of God,' nor '*a* Son of God,' nor 'of a God,' but 'of *the living* God;' transcendently above all others called *God*—THE JEHOVAH—THE I AM. The truth to be believed is not that Jesus is Christ, or Anointed, but '*the* Christ, *the* Son of the living God.' The records of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are four records of testimony concerning this great truth. Whoever reads these records understandingly, reads them with his eye fixed on this all-absorbing question, Is Jesus the Son of the living God? as they bear on it from first to last.

"The Lord having furnished the proposition to be believed, and the testimony on which to believe, how should the preacher go to work to make believers? Should he preach a sermon on the philosophy of faith? By no means. Preaching sermons on faith never made a believer in the world. How does a sensible attorney make a jury believe? He delivers no speech on the philosophy of faith or on faith. How, then, does he make his jury believe? He calls his witnesses and has them give their testimony to the jury. After all the testimony is stated, he makes a speech, summing up and applying the testimony and the law to the

case. How should the preacher of Jesus proceed? The people whom he would convince are his jury. The testimony found in the records of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John is the testimony he should lay before them. He should array it, sum it up, apply it to his proposition, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, showing that it is conclusive."

How different are these substantial, evangelical, earnest utterances, from the thin sentimentalisms of Mr. Collyer! There is in Mr. Collyer's sermons no nutritious food for the soul. The style is beautiful, the thoughts chaste and tender, and there is in them that which leaves no doubt of the high æsthetical culture of their author. But æsthetics is not religion. To walk amid flowers, to leisurely stroll through picture galleries, or to become encircled by the most wonderful exhibitions of *nature* and *art*, is one thing; but to come as a poor penitent sinner to the foot of the cross, to seek instruction from Him who is the "resurrection and the life," is another thing altogether. Hence, Mr. Collyer's type of preaching may *please*, may even cultivate and refine us, speaking after the manner of men, but it never can *save us from sin*, and prepare us for that "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." But this is just what we want with preaching, and, if it does not do this, the sooner the lyceum is substituted for the pulpit, the better. If mere lectures on "nature and life" are all that is necessary in order to the growth of the soul, then, by all means, let us have these, and dispense with preaching entirely. But æsthetical culture is one thing, and spiritual life is quite another. One may be promoted by such sermons as Mr. Collyer's, but in order to the development of the other, we need sterner stuff, a more sin-destroying Gospel than we find promulgated by modern rationalists.

3. The preaching of the present day needs to be more *ethical*. It is not enough to convert the people; they must be organized into churches, and developed into strong men and women in Christ. And in order to this, they must be instructed in the principles of the Christian life. They must be taught the exceeding sinfulness of sin and the excellence of virtue; that religion is a personal thing, and in order to a growth in grace and the knowledge of the truth, there must be a constant attention to the minor details of life, as well as the more prominent matters, which are usually considered the only things necessary. The truth is, real life is made up of little

things. Hence, the most insignificant details are of the greatest consequence in developing spiritual growth.

And, surely, unless there is spiritual development in the character and life of the Christian, there is little or no meaning in the expenditure of time and means for the conversion of the world. The preaching which stops with the conversion of the sinner, that simply introduces him into the Kingdom, then leaves him, ignorant of his relations to right and wrong, comes far short of meeting the entire obligations of the pulpit. It is good so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. What we call first principles are very essential; in fact, can not be dispensed with; but there is a class of preachers who never get farther than these. They measure the amount of good they do by the number of additions they are instrumental in making to the Church. They look back for their rewards to the "big meetings" they have held, to the multitudes who were there brought into the Kingdom, rather than to the great future, when the *real* value of every man's work shall be made fully manifest. Their rejoicing is in the Spring-time, in the day of planting, rather than in the Autumn, when the sheaves are gathered together amid the joyful shouts of "harvest-home."

We would not have our ministers do *less evangelizing*, but we would have them do *more teaching;* give more attention to the actual duties of religion, so that the Churches may every-where be living, earnest instruments for good, rather than the dead things which they too frequently are. Preaching, in short, should not be confined to the *chief* things, but to *all* things that will enable us to walk with and please God. It is one thing to bring a man into the Church, but it is quite another thing to help him on his way to heaven. The first must be done, but the last must not be left undone. In order to have an "abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," we must add to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly-kindness, and charity. And the preaching which does not develop these graces in our lives, fails in carrying out an important part of the great commission, namely: "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded."

It can not be said that either Mr. Spurgeon or Mr. Franklin excels in ethical preaching. They are both *aggressive* men, full of

anxiety to get on. Regarding the world as "lying in wickedness," their main object is to convert men, to enlist them under the great Captain of Salvation, and then leave them to be trained by others. True, Mr. Spurgeon has shown considerable ability in sustaining his work and building it up to permanent success. But whoever will examine closely into his labors will find that, after all, his success is chiefly owing to the constant additions made, from the world to the Church, rather than to any spiritual growth of the members, except such as is necessarily produced by the constant exhibitions of the power of the Gospel. But we would not be understood as even intimating that Mr. Spurgeon's preaching has none of the ethical element in it all. On the contrary, many of his sermons are good specimens of ethical preaching; but it is, nevertheless, quite evident that his greatest power, as a preacher, consists in his wonderful ability to awaken the conscience of the unconverted, and present Christ as a loving Savior to the penitent heart. Mr. Franklin's chief power is not exactly this, though he is not deficient in the element of earnest appeal. He is most at home, however, when instructing the already-awakened sinner in the conditions of the Gospel. Three things are essential to a full presentation of the Scheme of Redemption: 1. That man is a sinner. 2. That Jesus is the Savior; and, 3. How Jesus, the Savior, saves the sinner. In the proclamation of the first two points Mr. Spurgeon has no equal, and in a clear statement and enforcement of the last point Mr. Franklin has few superiors. But neither of them is strong in the matter of ethical preaching. This last is Mr. Goulburn's specialty. He has little power to convict sinners, and still less, if possible, to instruct them in the conditions of salvation; but, so far as a deep insight into the morality of Christianity, and power to eloquently and earnestly exhibit the personal aspects of religion are concerned, he is one of the finest preachers of the present century.

4. There is still another defect in the matter of the modern pulpit which needs to be remedied. We refer to the neglect of *practical* preaching—preaching which deals with the *acts* and *realities of life.* Fine-spun theories may afford entertainment to those who have a taste for such things; but if the minister of the Gospel wishes to become a power in exciting the conscience to a sense of sin and an appreciation of holiness; if he wishes to be what every minister

should be—an instrument in the hands of God for making men better and happier—he *must* become familiar with the great matters of the actual experience of men, their thoughts, feelings, and purposes. He must come down to the sorrows, temptations, misgivings, fears, amid which men are struggling, and, by exhibiting a generous sympathy for the *human side* in the great battle of life, win the confidence of poor, fallen men and women, and help them in their conflict with sin.

In this kind of preaching Mr. Beecher excels. He understands the human heart; has a keen appreciation of the motives and influences that impel men to action; knows the times in which he lives; watches, with intense interest, all passing events; and appropriates, with singular readiness, the great lessons of the hour. His theology is exceedingly lame. In fact, it can not be said that he has any theology at all; but his deep insight into the affairs of men, and the relations they sustain to each other, to time, and to eternity, greatly overbalances, so far as giving him power is concerned, all the defects in his theology. To put it in modern phraseology, he is a *live* man, has his eyes and ears open, sees and hears all that is passing, and knows how to make every thing tell in contributing to the strength and vitality of his ministry. As specimens of deep, earnest, practical preaching, many of his sermons are equal to any of their kind in the English language. In working out the spiritual elevation of men, *from the humanity center*, under the great all-controlling, all-powerful principle of love, sanctified and made pure through the influence of suffering, his sermons must and will do great good. But so far as teaching the sinner the way into the Kingdom is concerned, they are little more instructive than the book of Mormon. They are never strictly didactic, but are almost always highly practical. The following is a good specimen, taken from his sermon entitled "Crowned Suffering:"

"Hitherto religion, considered comprehensively and systematically, has not extended its force enough in the right direction. It has been a means of educating the conscience. Good men have been under the dominion chiefly of conscience since the world began; and, although religion has in it, unquestionably, an element of education for the conscience, yet that is not the distinguishing element. Religion has been a code of rules for conduct; it has been a system of ethics or morality; it has been introduced into external laws, and institutions, and functions; and it is to-day, to a limited extent, an instrumentality for external

recreation, but this is only the lower and earlier development of religion. Religion, as a love, taking precedence of all the other elements of the soul, asserting its authority, and compelling every thing else to bow to it, and to take law from it, has hardly been known except in single individuals. It has been but little known as an idea, and still less as a practical matter. We have had sporadic cases, but it has never been, to any considerable degree, wrought into the public sentiment of any age. The active force of the world has never been this great motive power of the Divine government. Religion has spent itself in marking out right paths for conduct, or securing penalties, or building churches and ecclesiastical institutions; religion has spent itself in worship, in minor charities, in refinements, in a thousand beneficent ways, but it has not thus fulfilled its whole mission. The day, however, is coming when the Church, when religion itself, is to take on the form of suffering love. Men seek to shield their love from suffering, or, if it must suffer, they seek to reap the field for themselves. A love that suffers for others, not once, and by a heroic struggle, but always, and easily, and naturally, is almost unknown. But there is to be a new disclosure in this matter. Much light has dawned, more is yet to dawn. And it is to come, not by dry mathematical problems; it is to come, not by the text; it is to come by putting on this suffering love of Christ Jesus! The full light is to come by development. Out of a nobler conception of love is to come nobler life—out of the experience of the full, tropical Summer of sacrificing, suffering love. And then the earth will put forth fruits such as were never suspected or dreamed of."

We have already consumed so much space in discussing the *matter* of discourse, that we have little room to say much concerning *manner.* Nor do we consider it necessary to treat this part of the subject at length, as it is only of secondary importance. Still, we would, by no means, undervalue a *proper manner.* It is certainly no recommendation to fine thoughts to have them delivered in a sort of hugger-mugger, jerking-out-of-words style; nor should we deem it a recommendation to a minister if he has contracted the habit of speaking in the professional, whang-doodle, drawling manner, which not unfrequently characterizes the modern pulpit. Such a style should not be tolerated *any where,* and certainly not in the pulpit. But it really seems as if ministers of the Gospel were laboring under the impression that this style belongs exclusively to them, and is a kind of mark of ministerial profession. We hope, however, that the time will not be long before the spell of this delusion is broken, for it is now both a shame and weakness of the pulpit, and should, therefore, at once and forever be abandoned.

We want more *manliness* in the pulpit. Our ministers should speak as men to men; should speak in the clear, dignified style of conscious rectitude; should speak as if they had some appreciation

of their high and holy calling, and had an earnest desire for the salvation of souls. Over-strained erudition on one hand, and commonplace on the other, should give way to a simple, unaffected, natural style—a common-sense presentation of the Gospel.*

We want, also, more *directness* in the manner of our pulpit. Circumlocutions are not in harmony with the spirit of the age, and will only serve as cradles in which to rock the people to sleep. Any preacher of the Gospel, who would now make a positive impression upon the people, must speak directly to them, in a language as pointed as it is possible to use.

Men are not going to New York by the way of New Orleans when there is a direct route by which they can save both time and money. Neither will they listen to preaching which consumes *patience*, as well as time and money; consequently, sermons, to be effective, should be short and pointed, and as free from unnecessary verbiage as possible. Dr. Neale tells us that "the ancient sermon contained many thoughts in few words, whereas the modern deals in many words and few thoughts;" but we do not think this is a fair representation of the matter. While the old masters were more learned, we are confident that their preaching was not as direct and as well adapted to the wants of the people as the preaching of modern times. Still we can not deny that the modern pulpit needs improvement, with respect even to directness.

But, above all, we need more *earnestness*. While nothing can compensate for a want of this, this may excuse a great many other defects. The common people, of all classes, like earnest speech. Doubtless, this is one reason why they heard the Savior gladly. His utterances bore with them the evidence that they came from a deeply earnest heart, one profoundly impressed with the sad condition of men, and their great need of help. His words were full of sympathy for the race, and the intonations of his voice rung through

*"I would not have preachers, in their sermons, use Hebrew, Greek, or foreign languages, for, in the church, we ought to speak as we used to do at home, the plain mother-tongue, which every one is acquainted with. It may be allowed in courtiers, lawyers, advocates, etc., to use quaint, curious words. Dr. Staupitz is a very learned man, yet he is a very irksome preacher; and the people had rather hear a plain brother preach, that delivers his words simply to their understanding, than he. In churches, no praising or extolling should be sought after. St. Paul never used such high and stately words as Demosthenes and Cicero did, but he spake, properly and plainly, words which signified and showed high and stately matters; and he did well."—*Table Talk of Luther*, *p.* 228–9.

the hearts of the people like the swelling melodies of hope. Consequently the multitudes followed him and hung on his deeply earnest eloquence.

The great problem of the pulpit to-day is, How shall we reach the masses? how shall the great *people* be converted to Christ? We believe that this problem can be solved only by having a reformation in the pulpit, both in matter and manner. The Gospel must be preached in its purity and simplicity, in all its facts, conditions, and promises, as "*the* power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it." Then there must be a corresponding teaching in "all things whatsoever is commanded," a practical application of the principles of the Christian religion to the solemn affairs of human life; and then all this must be insisted upon in a simple, unaffected, perspicuous, direct, earnest style—a style in harmony with the great and mighty realities of which it treats, that will rivet the attention, and make the hearer realize that the Christian religion is something more than a mere form, but is a fruitful and glorious life, which shall finally be rewarded with an unfading crown and joys eternal at God's right hand. With such a ministry the Church will soon become as "bright as the sun, as fair as the moon, and as terrible as an army with banners."

II.—THE FELLOWSHIP.

"*And they adhered steadfastly to the teaching of the apostles, and to the fellowship, to breaking of bread, and to the prayers.*" Acts II, 42.

IT does not need to be argued here that the second chapter of Acts contains a record of the first sermon that announced a complete redemption; the first accomplishment of the promised mission of the Holy Spirit to convict sinners and comfort saints, (John xvi, 7–14;) the first authoritative announcement of Jesus as Lord and Christ; the first publication of the Law of Pardon under the reign of the new Lawgiver, and the planting of the first Church of Christ. Its importance, therefore, as a starting point in our labors to restore New Testament Christianity, can hardly be exaggerated. That we have succeeded in developing, from this chapter, the beginning of the reign of the Christ, the mode of the Spirit's operation in the conversion of sinners, the unchanging law of pardon and of initiation into the Church of Christ, the infallible authority of the apostles to administer the affairs of the absent Lord, and the simple, spiritual worship of the primitive Church, is also, we think, beyond question.

On one subject, however, there has been dimness—that of the Fellowship. That the first Church adhered as steadfastly to the fellowship as to the teaching of the apostles, is positively affirmed; but precisely what is meant by fellowship, and how they continued in it, has been matter of so much doubt as to leave our Churches largely destitute of the blessings of fellowship, and render them failures, so far as this feature of primitive Christianity is concerned.

We propose, therefore, an examination of this word, and of its applications in Scripture, that we may ascertain if any definite conclusion can be reached as to its Scriptural import.

If it can be said to have any definite meaning among us, it is understood to signify the weekly contribution of money for benevolent purposes. Taking this as its strict import, there has been among us no other such instance of trifling with a Divine ordinance; for the paltry contribution, week by week, of dimes and half-dimes

by one-fourth or one-fifth of the members present at a Church meeting, is a shameful slurring over of any just idea of *fellowship* in a solemn duty enjoined on all the saints. It is a custom, we take it, "more honored in the breach than in the observance;" for there is just enough done to lull the conscience of the selfish into quietness, and to belittle one's ideas of Christian benevolence, while, for all the great purposes of true Church life, it is so insignificant as to inherit only contempt. It is offering the bran to God and keeping the flour to ourselves. Is this what is meant by Fellowship? Let us see.

Κοινωνια, here rendered *fellowship*, is not a term of doubtful import. In classic use *κοινός* signifies *common, shared in common;* in social and political relations, *common to all the people, public, the common weal;* of disposition, *tending a ready ear to all, impartial; connected by common origin, kindred,* especially of brothers and sisters. These are its principal classic uses, as given by Liddell and Scott. The same authority defines *κοινωνια*, *communion, community, intercourse.* Its sacred use is given in New Testament lexicons as *fellowship, partnership, participation, communion, aid, relief, contribution in aid.*

It will be seen, at a glance, that unless the Scriptures make a rigorous application of this term to some one specific act or ordinance, the word itself would suggest nothing of the kind, but would rather lead us to think of community of interest or of obligation—of the spiritual kinship established in Christ, the *partnership* of duties, of interest, and of destiny which is peculiar to the great brotherhood called the Church of God.

We ask, then, Do the Scriptures limit this term to a specific act or ordinance? The best answer to this is found in the texts in which the word occurs:

Acts ii, 42: They continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and *fellowship.*
Rom. xv, 26: To make a certain *contribution.*
1 Cor. i, 9: Called unto the *fellowship* of his Son.
1 Cor. x, 16: Is it not the *communion* of the blood? is it not the *communion* of the body of Christ?
2 Cor. vi, 14: What *communion* hath light with darkness?
2 Cor. viii, 4: And take upon us the *fellowship.*
2 Cor. ix, 13: For your liberal *distribution.*
2 Cor. xiii, 14: The *communion* of the Holy Ghost.

Gal. ii, 9: The right hands of *fellowship.*
Eph. iii, 9: What is the *fellowship* of the mystery?
Phil. i, 5: For your *fellowship* in the Gospel.
Phil. ii, 1: If any *fellowship* of the Spirit.
Phil. iii, 10: And the *fellowship* of his sufferings.
Philem. 6: That the *communication* of thy faith.
Heb. xiii, 16: And to *communicate* forget not.
1 John i, 3: May have fellowship with us; and truly our *fellowship* is with the Father.
1 John i, 6: If we say that we have *fellowship.*
1 John i, 7: We have *fellowship* one with another.

We add to these the occurrences of κοινωνός:

Matt. xxiii, 30: We would not have been *partakers.*
Luke v, 10: Which were *partners* with Simon.
1 Cor. x, 18: *Partakers* of the altar.
1 Cor. x, 20: Ye should have *fellowship* with.
2 Cor. i, 7: As ye are *partakers* of the sufferings.
2 Cor. viii, 23: He is my *partner* and fellow-helper.
Philem. 17: If thou count me, therefore, a *partner.*
Heb. x, 33: Ye became *companions* of them.
1 Peter v, 1: And also a *partaker* of the glory.
2 Peter i, 4: Be *partakers* of the Divine nature.

It will be readily seen that the term is not restricted to a special use—is limited to no specific application as indicating a particular act or observance of a particular ordinance; but is freely used to express almost every phase of that precious spiritual fellowship which links Father, Son, and Holy Spirit with those who are baptized into these sacred names, and all the baptized, in one great copartnery. The joint privileges, responsibilities, and duties of all the members of this spiritual family, as well as their common relationship to God as their Father, to the Son as their Redeemer, and to the Holy Spirit as their Comforter, all find expression in this word.

It is readily granted that this word is sometimes used in reference to money—joint contributions for benevolent purposes. It is not only readily granted, but we are anxious to have it known, that it may be fully understood that in regard to outlays of money for all good purposes there is a *joint responsibility*—a partnership, from the duties of which no member of the firm is to be allowed to escape. But what we now are desirous to impress upon our readers is, that this does not exhaust the applications of the word; that it has a

much wider range, and conveys a much larger idea of our relationships and duties, than can be found in it when this specific application is urged. It expresses partnership in the blessings of the death of Christ, (1 Cor. x, 16;) in the strength and comfort of the Holy Spirit, (2 Cor. xiii, 14;) in the sufferings of Christ, (Phil. iii, 10;) in all the blessings of the Gospel, (Phil. i, 5;) in the favor and protection of God, (1 John i, 3.)

Nor is it necessary to deny that there is a somewhat special use of the term in the immediate application of it in Acts ii, 42. Verses 44, 45 favor the idea that in its first use it was meant to describe that generous outflow of regenerated hearts in which all participated; but as none of those for whom we are now writing insist on this as any part of the permanent order of the Church, we have a general agreement that this does not exhaust the import of *the fellowship*, and that we must seek farther for a full comprehension of its meaning.

The passage most nearly parallel with Acts ii, 42, is 1 John i, 3: "*The things which we have seen and heard declare we unto you,* (the apostle's doctrine,) *that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.*"

In the light of the classical and Scriptural import of this term, we are constrained to regard the Church of God as a grand partnership, in which God and man come into most intimate relations. In this firm there are *Divine* partners—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and these three agree in one. There are also *human* partners. All who are baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit enter into partnership with God and with each other, for certain clearly defined purposes.

In brief, these objects are, 1. To redeem a world of perishing sinners from ignorance, sin, and death; 2. To educate such as are saved for the dignities and felicities of immortality. To lift men of all nations and all generations from death to life, from sin to holiness, from vileness and shame to glory and honor, and make the heirs of wrath and ruin the inheritors of heaven's immortal honors and delights; this is the mighty enterprise which God has set on foot, to which Father, Son, and Holy Spirit give their united treasures of wisdom, love, and power, and in which they invite the coöperation of all who have hearts to love and hands to toil.

We stand in the presence of this stupendous scheme, awed into reverence and adoration, and seem to hear the voice of God sounding in our ears: "Take off thy shoes from thy feet, for the ground whereon thou standest is holy ground." To us it is idle to ask for other evidence of the divine origin of the Gospel. Any one familiar with the workings of his own heart, or the history of the human race, knows the inevitable tendency to ever-increasing selfishness. The history of our race is a history of grasping selfishness. Self, kindred, sect, country—these exhaust the love and sympathy of the human heart; and even the free play of these is disturbed within these narrow circles by selfish antagonisms. But *philanthropy*—where does that dwell? Who loves *the race?* What school of uninspired ethics ever taught this sublime virtue? Even after enjoying the light of Christ's teachings for eighteen hundred years, the World and the Church are controlled by narrow selfishness; the great lessons of philanthropy are not half comprehended; the Earth is drunk with blood; the groans of the oppressed issue even from under the altar; the narrow and virulent spirit of sect is the highest inspiration of most religious movements; and

> "Man's inhumanity to man
> Makes countless thousands mourn."

When we see through what slow and painful processes men are enabled to grasp the conception which the Gospel furnishes of the love of man as man, and how utterly unworthy are our best conceptions of what is due to our fellow-creatures, who can believe that the selfish heart of man ever gave birth to such a scheme of benevolence as the New Testament unfolds? "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Talk not of miracles and prophecies. The grandest of all miracles is the Sinless Sufferer dying to redeem the race that scorned him; and all the tongues and harps of prophets are hushed into dead silence before that matchless oracle, "*God so loved the World that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have eternal life.*" Philosophy is dumb; the worthiest religions are abashed; the glories of the grandest empires fade into nothingness; sages, poets, statesmen, heroes—even the purest and best of them—are nothing, and less than nothing, and altogether vanity, when this founder of the everlasting

age reveals his wonderful counsel, and projects this divine scheme of the universal Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God.

Into this grand partnership all true believers enter. In it they stand on one common platform as brethren in the Lord. All the selfish and wicked distinctions prevailing in human society are lost. There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither male nor female, neither bond nor free, but all are one in Christ Jesus. Redeemed from a common ruin by a common ransom, and made heirs of a common inheritance, they meet on the common level of Christian brotherhood—the rich rejoicing that he is made low, the poor that he is exalted, and all that they are the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. There are no ecclesiastical dignities even. No man is allowed to be called master. "All ye are brethren." All are priests to God—all constitute God's clergy or heritage. 1 Pet. v, 3. The least in the kingdom is, by virtue of his redemption and sanctification in Christ Jesus, greater than the greatest official dignitaries. Matt. xi, 11. Nay, it is more to be a member of this grand copartnery than to be the brightest and highest angel in Heaven; for the latter are *all* ministering servants of the former, (Heb. i, 14,) and in their highest ministries they are honored with no such mission as belongs to the members of this fellowship.

Let it now be said—and this brings us into the very heart of our subject—*that every one coming into this partnership brings in with him all his capital, and invests it all in the common stock for the benefit of the firm.*

The highest, deepest, vastest treasures of Divine wisdom, love, power, holiness, justice, truth, mercy, compassion, and condescension are invested in this scheme. The ineffable glories and riches of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are embarked in it. "The unsearchable riches of Christ," "the depths of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God," and the "deep things" of the Spirit, are all funded for the benefit of this enterprise. The universe is laid under tribute—the wealth of the ages belongs to it.

Every convert brings into the common treasury all that he owns. In this fellowship "no man lives to himself." It is written over the door of entrance, "Ye are not your own." It is a mistake to suppose that having "all things common" was peculiar to the Church in Jerusalem. That particular form of bestowal and distribution evidently

grew out of peculiar circumstances; but in *principle* and in *essence*, the religion is the same; and, although a change in circumstances may work a change in the *incidents* of giving, the duty of bringing our all and laying it down at the apostles' feet, to be appropriated under apostolic authority, is the same now as then—*and the Ananiases and Sapphiras who keep back part of the price will yet be carried out dead, as liars against the Spirit of God.*

We are aware that these are "hard sayings," and that many will ask, "Who, then, can be saved?" We can only reply, "With men these things are impossible, but with God all things are possible." It is time that all who are "at ease in Zion" had a "woe" sounded in their ears that may startle them from their false security. It is time to strip off the delusive idea that any acceptance of doctrine, or any formal observance of ordinances, can avail to save a soul that refuses entire consecration of all its powers to the great aims of the Church of God. It is especially due to the integrity of the Gospel and the purity of the Church, that the narrow and mean selfishness which gives to God its tithings of mint, and anise, and cumin, and reserves for the lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, its wealth of devotion, service, and money, should be branded as an accursed thing, and banished without the camp.

As individual stewards of God, we have a control of our means which others have not, and have a right to employ our resources, under a sense of our personal accountability to the Master; but as *partners* in this great scheme, we owe to the firm our *just share* of toil and of money, and of whatever we possess that the partnership needs. We speak not of money only nor chiefly, *but of whatever we possess that the common cause requires.* "Freely ye have received, freely give." "For we, being many, are one body in Christ, *and every one members one of another.*"

We have said that the ordinary bases of human distinction are ignored in this brotherhood. There is no aristocracy of wealth, nor of intellect, nor of blood. All these are perishable; *but the heart may grow forever.* Goodness is immortal. Love is more than all knowledge, all eloquence, all power. This brotherhood, therefore, is based on *character*—on the possession of the love of God; for "he that loveth is born of God and knoweth God."

There is, however, a variety of gifts, and there must be wisdom

and economy in their appropriation. While, then, all the members of this fellowship stand on a common platform of dignity as children of God, it does not follow that there shall be no official distinctions—no division of labor. God has wisely distributed his gifts so that every one shall have need of his brethren, and all his brethren shall have need of him. This mutual dependence makes society indispensable, and saves us from lawless invasions of the rights of others. But as equal partners in a mercantile firm, possessing different gifts, will make such a division of labor as will enable every one to work most successfully for the benefit of all—one acting as book-keeper, another as salesman, another attending to the purchases, another to collections, etc.—so here, wisdom demands that the variety of gifts shall be classified, and their possessors assigned to such departments of service as will render them most useful to the interests of the Partnership. To illustrate:

1. Here is one on whom is bestowed the "gift of tongues." He is an orator. He brings his treasures of eloquence and lays them down at the feet of the apostles. Now, he is under no more obligations to preach the Gospel than any other member of the Church, except as his gift lies in that direction. It is the business of the Partnership to preach the Gospel, but the law of the apostles—the directors of this enterprise—is, "As every one has received the gift, so let him minister." "But," this brother says, "I have a family to support; the duty to provide for them is imperative; I can not preach only subordinately to their maintenance." But other members of the Partnership come forward and say, "You can preach better than we; we can make money better than you. You attend to our preaching—we will see to your money-making. You preach—we will make money; *and we will share.* We will be partners in your preaching, and you shall be a partner in our money-making." *This is "fellowship."* The preaching and the money-making are alike *in the firm.*

2. Here is one gifted to *rule*—a rare gift. It is all-important that it be made available for the general good; and if the general interests require that his whole time be given to this work, then the Partnership must see that while he attends to their interests, they attend to his. So of teachers, ministers, etc. If the Partnership demands all their time, or a considerable portion of it, they must be maintained by the Partnership. And then righteousness requires that, in the

service of the Partnership, *they religiously render service equivalent to that which they receive from it.* If there must be an end to the selfishness and penuriousness of Church-members, *there must also be an end to the indolence of preachers.* The round of easy visits at favorite resorts—the daily snooze—the hours of idle gossip—the week-long loungings, fishings, and recreations, must give place to hard study and hard work for those who are working for him; and, we opine, there will be less complaint of poorly paid preachers when they earn a fair title to compensation by incessant toil, such as other callings demand in order to success.

3. Praying, singing, exhorting—gifts in these directions are not equally distributed. A wise division of labor in these departments is essential to the complete edification of the Church. It should be understood that none is at liberty to withhold the talents which could be employed for the general good; but that, under the direction of the competent authorities, every one shall bring in his capital into the fellowship.

4. Money-making is a gift. Some men are evidently sent into this world on purpose to make money; and, in spite of pulpit homilies and diatribes to the contrary, we hold that those whose gifts from God fit them for successful business life, may "buy and sell and get gain" as religiously as they can pray or sing, and as much "to the glory of God." In no paths of life are there better opportunities to glorify God than in the daily walks of business life, in perpetual contact with men, and amid phases of life and revelations of heart that show the surest avenues to the judgment and the conscience, for men's salvation. The error is not in making money, nor so much in bending one's energies to the task—for "whatever is worth doing is worth doing well;" but it is *in failing to bring the gift into the Partnership.* These money-makers must learn to "continue steadfastly in the fellowship;" and if they refuse to do so, they ought, after due admonition and patient effort to save them, to be dismissed from the firm. The man of wealth is under as sacred an obligation to bring his money into the Partnership, as is the orator to bring his gifts of speech, or the musician his gifts of song, or the ruler his ability to govern. Nor, if we have a multiplicity of gifts, can the appropriation of any one of them be accepted in lieu of the others. If we combine wealth and the ability to rule, or the ability to preach,

we can not make the bestowal of the gift of preaching a reason for withholding the gift of money, any more than the eyes can insist on rendering precisely equal service with the nose, or the hands with the feet. Every member of the body is under obligations to render all the service it can for the general weal; and whether that be much or little, all the other members are partakers of its benefits. The *principle* is still true which is expressed in the Old Testament: "*They that gathered much had nothing over; and they that gathered little had no lack.*"

5. There are many other gifts which we will not take space to enumerate here, which a wise supervision of the interests, wants, and capacities of the Church will call into exercise. It may be safely laid down as a principle, that no member of the Partnership should remain unemployed.

This gives to the Eldership in our Churches a much more responsible task than is generally allowed to them, or than they are willing to accept. An *Overseer*, in this Partnership, should learn of the various gifts at his disposal. He should be a good judge of men—capable of seeing at a glance the places to be filled, and the persons best qualified to fill them. He should be able to train them for their work, and to go before them in it.

> "And as a bird each fond endearment tries
> To tempt its new-fledged offspring to the skies,
> He tries each art, reproves each dull delay,
> Allures to brighter worlds, *and leads the way.*"

When we come to understand the *working* character of the Church, the selection of overseers and guides will be a much graver task than at present, and the work of an overseer will be found to demand the highest and rarest qualifications, and daily and hourly attention. Moreover, the insubordination now so prevalent will be condemned as dishonorable and injurious to the general interest, and it will be required that when the appointed rulers direct any one to a given work, it shall be accepted, unless there are satisfactory reasons for declining the task. Let the reader turn to Rom. xii, and 1 Cor. xii, and give them careful attention, and he can not fail to be convinced that the ideal Church presented to us in the New Testament is that of a community bound by common ties in a spiritual communism, to the prosperity of which every member is bound to

communicate to the full extent of his or her ability; and that its variety of ministries is under a suitable headship. This is the "Fellowship" of the Scriptures. The door-keeper and the ruler—the orator and the janitor—are *partners* in a mutual work.

But while we pass by numerous ministries which a wise oversight will provide for, there are some strangely neglected services to which we feel bound to call special attention.

Why is it that Christian women find so little employment in the service of the Church? Not only is their position inferior, but it is largely useless. They do, indeed, make a little work for themselves in a Dorcas society; they are sometimes dignified as Deaconesses—it being understood that the sum of their duties is to prepare female candidates for baptism; and if a festival is called for to coax money out of unwilling hands for the purchase of a church carpet, or a new stove pipe, the culinary skill of the sisters is invoked right earnestly. But except in occasional service of this kind, the sum of a woman's duty in the Church is to listen reverently, and, with a hymn-book before her, to sing by rote! We can not forbear asking, why this persistent refusal to enlist the warm devotions, and generous sympathies, and earnest activities of Woman in this high service? She is more religious than man. She has greater powers of endurance in patient toil and suffering. There is abundant work which can best be done under the promptings of womanly instincts, and by the gentleness of womanly ministrations. Does not the Apostle say, "*There is neither male nor female?*" Let it be granted that there are duties from which her sex and her peculiar organization debar her. Are there not duties enough left for which she is admirably adapted?

Her loving ministries in behalf of the despised Nazarene are among the most touching illustrations of faith and devotion in the Gospel narratives; her steadfast adherence to the Man of Sorrows is marred by no cowardice, disgraced by no treachery.

> "Not she with traitorous kiss her Savior stung,
> Not she denied him with unholy tongue;
> She, when apostles shrank, could dangers brave—
> Last at the cross, and earliest at the grave."

In the primitive Church she shared the labors and honors of the Partnership. The women with the men continued, "with one accord," in prayer and supplication till the hour of Pentecostal solem-

nity and triumph. The promised Spirit came to the *daughters* as well as to *sons*—to the *maidens* equally with the *young men*. Dorcas, Lydia, the daughters of Philip, Phœbe, Priscilla, Euodias, and Syntyche are specimens of the active ministers of the Church who, in various capacities, were "fellow-workers" with the apostles and brethren. Let us mention some kinds of active service in which godly women might find useful employment.

1. In our cities and large towns there are thousands and tens of thousands of neglected people who never attend Church, and whose moral condition would be an offense even to heathenism. They can only be reached by personal visitations, by benevolent attentions, by schools and religious meetings conducted in their midst. There are also thousands of outcasts, driven to a life of shame by the heartlessness of society and the wrongs of offenders who go unwhipped of justice. They are encompassed with the horrors of utter hopelessness, and sink into the depths of crime under the irresistible pressure of a false public sentiment. We can not burden this paper with the startling statistics which are now before us—a fearful dishonor to any Christian land.

Now, our ministers, and elders, and leading men excuse themselves, on the score of pressing engagements, from any labors in these directions; and, generally, we are inclined to regard the excuse as just. But here are intelligent and godly women, who have to toil for daily bread, to whom this would be a welcome work. A very moderate compensation would enlist them at once. They would glide like angels of mercy through these dark scenes of woe and despair, and in the name of Jesus open the prison doors of captive souls, bind up broken hearts, and make known to them that sit in darkness the light of life. Why are they not employed? Who can tell? With the large wealth of intelligence, and sympathy, and strength that lies idle in our Churches, is it possible to go before God free from the blood of these perishing souls?

2. There are much-needed ministries to be established among the homeless sick and dying. Homes, hospitals, asylums, refuges, are needed for the victims of misfortunes. It is the work of the Church. It is woman's work. The State may attempt to accomplish it, and we may attempt to stifle our consciences by the reflection that we have paid our taxes; but there is a work for the

Church which the State can not do—spiritual ends to be sought which can be reached through no State machinery, and a *sympathetic* labor to be accomplished which no State system can command. Women like Elizabeth Fry, Dorothea Dix, Florence Nightingale, and the nameless host of worthies who, during our late war, were present on battle-field, in the march, in the ambulance, and in every hospital, abundantly and gloriously illustrate the capacity, bravery, endurance, and administrative ability of woman in such work. The growing power of the Roman Catholic Church in this country is asserted over the best class of converts by the gentle and loving ministries of her sisterhoods. It is more invincible than logic. You argue in vain in the presence of toilsome, patient, and gentle ministries that touch every heart and bring tears to every eye. It hides a multitude of sins. Unless Protestants awake to the demands of the times, and furnish at least equal proofs of needed benevolence, they will be shorn of their power. The power of the primitive Church was largely in her Divine charities; the Church of to-day must not be wanting in this particular, or learning, eloquence, wealth, and respectability will not be sufficient to save her from disgrace.

3. The mission work, at home and abroad, opens many channels of usefulness for woman. Where the heaviest amount of labor is private rather than public—and this is the case in almost all new missionary fields—woman can be the ready and efficient helper of man. In our own land, among the freedmen, there is employment for thousands of patient, gentle, pious women; and the Church has them and ought to send them.

We pretend not to have exhausted, in our statement, the opportunities for profitable employment for Christian women; but we have said enough to show that there *are* such opportunities, and that it is a great folly, if not a great sin, on the part of the Church, to shut out so much of her worthiest force from participation in the "fellowship" of labor and of reward.

If we have said but little of *money* as belonging to the fellowship, it is not because we deem it unimportant, but rather because that phase of the subject has been faithfully sketched by other pens, while those phases which have engaged our attention have been largely overlooked. We take occasion to say, however, that in

money, as in all other elements of power, there must be *partnership.* It is but a partial restoration of the "ancient order of things" which leaves this unaccomplished. While we are not convinced that there is any Divine law prescribing a uniform method of raising money, we are quite sure that, as a general rule, the method prescribed by Paul to the Corinthians and Galatians is the cheapest, easiest, justest, and most effective of all known expedients: "On the first day of every week let *every one* lay by him in store, *as God has prospered him.*" This will always give money in hand, will save all expensive agencies, will keep Churches out of debt, and enable them to appropriate to her various benevolent enterprises a fair proportion of means. He who shall educate the Churches to faithfulness in this particular will render to the cause of God a service of incalculable value.

Before closing we must offer a few suggestions touching another and most important phase of this subject—fellowship with God and with Christ.

There are many Christian lives that partake more of the bondage of the law than of the liberty of the Gospel. They lack sunshine. They are consciously far away from "the fellowship of the Spirit." They are unblessed with any Divine manifestations, uncomforted with any "earnest of the inheritance." It is all tame and hard drudgery. They sigh for the light of God's countenance, and sigh in vain. Tell them to read the Scriptures, and they will confuse you with assertions of its utter fruitlessness in their own experience. Urge them to pray, and they will tell you that all their prayers have failed to produce one rift in the clouds that hang in thick darkness over them.

These are cases which need to be treated in the light of these teachings concerning fellowship. A man may live in the Church, and share

> "Her sweet communion, solemn vows,
> Her hymns of love and praise,"

and still fail of joyful fellowship *with his brethren.* Why? Because he is not a *partner* with them in their toils and anxieties. He sings, but he does not work; he prays, but he does not pay; he communes in the Supper, but he does not commune in the sacrifices, and toils, and cares of the house of God. Consequently, "there is a great

gulf" between him and them; while they are rejoicing over the fruits of their labors, and happy in projecting new toils, his barren heart pines in desolation. He lives in the midst of love without enjoying it. *He must come on to the same plane of labor and suffering with them* if he would enjoy their fellowship. And if such a failure shuts one out from the fellowship of *his brethren,* is it strange that it should shut him out from *the fellowship of God?* Not at all. Prayer is indispensable to this fellowship; so is Bible knowledge; but these are not all. A man can not pray himself into fellowship with the *suffering* Christ; he must suffer with him. He can not *read* himself into fellowship with the *loving* Christ; he must give himself to similar labors of love, and in such experiences as that life gives him he will be able to interpret the heart of Christ and enter into its sympathies. There will be no lack of influx of heavenly light and peace when we place our souls in a position to receive it. But religion is not mere sentiment, nor a mere creed, nor a ritual; *it is a life.* He who would know its treasures must partake of its life. "If a man love me, *he will keep my sayings;* and he shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." "Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man *hear my voice,* and *open the door,* I will come in and sup with him, and he with me." But the voice of Jesus calls us to share his labors and his sorrows; and if we "open the door" it is to bid him welcome, to take us and guide us into his own paths of self-abnegation and self-sacrifice. It is only in some Gethsemane that we can understand the tempests that swept over his soul, or know the sweet peace that succeeded; only when the world has altogether forsaken us that we can see the strong angel of God at our side; only through the Cross that we can reach the crown. The poor woman who cast all her living into the treasury of the Lord could have better interpreted the sayings and doings of Jesus, and have approached into a more immediate intimacy with him, than the most learned and acute of selfish, carnal, ease-loving Pharisees or Sadducees in the land. It is thus that his counsels are hidden from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes.

It can not but be evident, in the light of the considerations we have submitted, that our Churches have by no means fully entered into "the fellowship." We have resources enough to fulfill our

mission, but they fail of appropriation. *There is no genuine partnership* of labor and of expenditure. The mass of our membership exhaust their piety in church-going, sermon-listening, and the payment of such trifling sums as must be paid to maintain a respectable standing. The genuine workers are few; so are the voluntary contributors. There is no consecration of *all* to Christ—no laying down of all our treasures at the Apostles' feet. The result is leanness, barrenness, impotency. We are smitten with mildew and blasting—the locusts and caterpillars eat up our substance. We receive as we give. We give little to God, and we receive little in return. We are shut out from the highest *joys* of spiritual fellowship, because we shut ourselves out from its highest *duties*. We are looking for happiness in a wrong direction. We seek it in selfishness, in ease, in the world's voluptuousness; it is found in giving, in toiling, in suffering, in condescension, in compassion, in self-denial for others' good. Its abode is in Bethlehem, in Gethsemane, at Calvary, and in the eternal home of love and joy to which *these only* lead. We can only know the "power of Christ's resurrection" after we have known "the fellowship of his sufferings," and have been made "conformable to his death." The beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount distill not in the souls that riot in abundance and revel in selfish enjoyments. Heaven's immortal fellowships belong only to a brotherhood of heroic and patient sufferers, who have "come up out of great tribulation, and washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Man of Sorrows! Divine Sufferer! Toiling Son of God! teach us to be willing to know the fellowship of thy labors and thy sorrows, and to give our little all to Thee, who gavest all for us. Then shall we have fellowship with each other; then will thy blood cleanse us from all sin; then shall we have unclouded views of thy glory, and rise to the possession of the everlasting fellowship of heavenly rest and joy.

III.—AN INFALLIBLE CHURCH, OR AN INFALLIBLE BOOK—WHICH?

THERE is an unappeasable longing in every heart for spiritual repose. "Come unto me," said the Savior, "and I will give you rest." It is obvious, from this passage, that Jesus himself recognizes this universal desire, and that he has provided for it. The soul can not, and if it be healthy will not, long brook uncertainty in matters of eternal moment; and any system of religion, or any ecclesiasticism, that fails to satisfy the mind of man upon this vital point, is altogether unsuited to the dearest necessity of his being, and can not long claim his allegiance. The Christian religion, we have been taught, is adapted to man *as he is*. If this be true—and we do not presume to gainsay it—then Christianity must, in a large sense, respect the natural impulses of the heart. It seeks not to benumb the faculties with hard and unnatural doctrines; and because the framers of human creeds have either forgotten or ignored this fact, we find that many of the most cherished dogmas of the various schools of theology are permitted to drop into oblivion without a tear or regret. Christianity forces not the native stream into an alien channel. It takes cognizance of man just as it finds him. It appeals to his holiest and tenderest sympathies. It is its province to guide, to educate, to gently restrain, in their appointed courses, what are commonly called the *natural* tendencies of man's deathless spirit.

A profound mystery enshrouds this being of ours. Brought into this mortal state without any volition of our own—mortal, however, as it respects the physical nature of man only; immortal as it respects what we denominate his higher, or spiritual nature—we find ourselves hurried along by an irresistible tide, and with the speed of the lightning's wing, to whatever doom may await us in the realm beyond the river of death. Orphaned, inexperienced, ignorant—we long to lay hold upon some mighty hand that can deliver us. We long to cast our eternal fortunes upon something in which we may safely and confidently trust.

Who has not experienced feelings akin to these? Who, amidst

all the doubt and uncertainty with which this life is environed, has not cried, "O, that I knew where I might find him! that I might come even to his seat! I would order my cause before him, and fill my mouth with arguments. I would know the words which he would answer me, and understand what he would say unto me."

A distinguished literary man has said that the most priceless treasure in the universe is an unfaltering religious belief. No matter whether the object of the man's faith be worthy or unworthy; given, that he believes in his religious system with all his heart, then must he necessarily be a happy man; for, in such a case, the highest possible demand of his spiritual nature has been met, and fully satisfied. "And therefore," said this philosopher, "I would rather have such a simple and unquestioning faith than to be the ruler of an empire." This man was right. A little will suffice for the bodily wants; a little bread, a little raiment, a shelter from the storm, and the body will do well enough. But not so the spirit. There is a spirit dwelling in this body that is not so easily satisfied; its clamorous tongue can not be so easily silenced. It demands something that we, of ourselves, have not to give. It drives us far beyond the range and scope of our own limited resources. But for this spirit, man would lie down with the quietness and apathy of the dull ox.

At this precise point our spiritual throes begin. The spirit demands that which is as infallible as God himself; it seeks a foundation as enduring as the throne of Jehovah. But all that we see around us is fallible and evanescent—as fallible, indeed, as man is weak; as evanescent as his earthly glory. In the beginning of the dispensation of grace, this question, in its general bearings, was better understood than it now is. The Jews had witnessed the decadence of the grandest monarchy on earth, and the desecration of a temple that was, at one period of their eventful history, the glory of the whole world. Groaning, as they were, under political bondage, imposed by a foreign despot, and cut up, as they were, into numerous fiercely conflicting sects in their religion, they had beheld the removal of almost every landmark of their ancient greatness and splendor. They were the victims of unrest and instability, and, but for their religious education, they, too, would, in the very streets of Jerusalem, have erected an altar to the unknown God. They had measurably lost faith in their religion, and had come to regard the

story of their former national prestige as a bitter jest or horrid mockery. Vague ideas, indeed, of a Deliverer, of a Restorer, floated among them, but scarcely made an impression upon the popular mind. That the throne and kingdom of the royal David would be reëstablished and perpetuated, they had a dim notion. National stability, religious confidence—these were the blessings for which their eager hearts most longingly panted. Accordingly, one of the very first lessons taught them by the successor of David was, that in him they should find *rest*—but rest for their *souls*. The question as to the possible perpetuity of earthly kingdoms had been settled—settled forever. These are but the glittering baubles of time—the splendid visions of dreamers. The soul needs something more than the gilded pageantry of earthly courts. "In the world you shall have tribulation," was one of his lessons, "but in me you shall have peace. My Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and my government shall never be destroyed. Of its increase there shall be no end, and the stone cut out of the mountain without hands shall finally fill the world." Such were the hopes held out to his disciples by the Great Teacher. The people had known only of earthly kingdoms, but he spoke only of the heavenly Kingdom. It was, hence, in harmony with the teachings of the Master that the Apostle Paul said to the converted Hebrews, many years subsequently, "We have received a kingdom that can not be moved." Such a kingdom, then, the Lord Jesus Christ came to found. Its subjects were to be gathered from the kingdoms of this world, and as to their actual citizenship there was to be no more doubt than of the existence of God himself. This world, indeed, was to be its territory—its battle-ground—the scene alike of its conflicts and victories. Laws were to be promulged, rewards promised to the obedient, and threatenings of wrath denounced against every enemy of this new but everlasting Kingdom.

But will this new monarchy succeed? Is there any reasonable doubt of its final and certain triumph? As the shortest way to answer these questions, another shall be propounded, namely: *Are all the conditions of success found to inhere in the founder of this Kingdom?* Did he undertake that which he is unable to accomplish? These are vital and fundamental questions. This, indeed, is the pivotal point upon which the whole question of the stability and perpetuity of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ turns.

Laws do but reflect the virtues and the vices of those for whom they are made. In this, no more than in any thing else, can the stream rise above its fountain. And the same thing is true of the ruler personally. If there remain any opposing force which he can not conquer, then he may himself be conquered. If there be any power which he can not control, then by it he may himself be controlled. Apply these tests to Jesus Christ as his *character*, and the *nature of his Kingdom* are portrayed in the Bible, and we have no difficulty in determining the question, Are all the conditions of success found to inhere in the Founder of the heavenly Kingdom? We find, indeed, every condition of success fulfilled in him by which it is possible for finite intelligence to judge. Virtue, wisdom, power, authority—these are the conditions of the success of any enterprise of moment.

It is now too late in the history of the world to raise any question as to the virtue, wisdom, power, or authority of Jesus. Still, in this place, we shall give it one moment's attention. He was, here upon the earth, the very incarnation of virtue; in him dwelt then all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge; there is absolutely *no* power that he can not control; and all authority in heaven and on earth is given into his hands. Cæsar performed prodigies of valor; he adorned his august brow with the crown of an emperor; he passed into the darkness of the grave; but from the darkness of that grave great Cæsar has never yet emerged. All his thundering and victorious legions could not break the spell of death. Death at last proved the mightier of the two.

> "But yesterday the word of Cæsar might
> Have stood against the world; now lies he there,
> And none so poor to do him reverence."

But from the contemplation of Cæsar turn we to Jesus of Nazareth. He had no earthly prestige; he had no Senate to frame laws for him; he had no armed hosts to execute his decrees; he had no royal patronage to dispense. But he did many mighty deeds; he wore a crown, but it was a crown of thorns; he, too, passed into the silence of the tomb, but death had no power to hold him there. Cæsar's subjects are not to be found among all the kingdoms of men, but the followers of Jesus are numbered by millions.

Time, too, tests the strength of the foundations of empires; but time—if we may so speak—has only consolidated and established the throne of the Prince Messiah. Perpetuity, stability, confidence—these were to be the distinguishing features of the Kingdom of heaven; and these ideas had a conspicuous place in the teaching of Jesus Christ and the prime ministers of his Kingdom. First demonstrating his own absolute immortality, his final word of parting was, "I am with you all the days, even to the end of the age."

He was the Stone of prophecy, the Stone rejected by the Jewish builders, the Stone that was to become the head of the corner. The fundamental principle, the vital truth of his empire, the truth comprehending all truth of Divine revelation, was succinctly stated in a single proposition—JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. "*On this Rock*," he said, "*I will build my Church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it.*" This, then, is the foundation truth of the Christian religion; this is the Rock upon which the vast superstructure of Christianity rests. Destroy this foundation, establish the fact that Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee is not the Christ, that he is not Divine, and we would not give a farthing for all the Churches in the world, or for the hopes of humanity beyond the grave. His confession expresses simply and concisely the infallible truth of the Infinite God. A Church, therefore, built upon *this* truth—a Church which adopts this truth as its creed—a Church whose practical life is in strict conformity to this truth—a Church, in brief, which in its organization is found to be in perfect harmony with this truth as practically developed in the ministry of the apostles, *is an infallible Church.* But no other Church is. Such a Church, and such a Church only, is infallible in its foundation, infallible in its creed, infallible in its organization, and infallible in its ideas of practical Church life. It is the truth, then, that makes the Church infallible. Is this proposition true? Pause over it—pause over it long if you will—before you reply, for upon the truth or falsity of this proposition depends the religious problem of the age. This is *the* issue now before the religious world. Happy the man who is ready and eager to enter the lists upon the right side. If this proposition be true, then it is a tremendous truth, involving tremendous consequences; but if it be false, then all Protestantism is a lie and a cheat, and only Rome is true. The religious problem

which demands solution of this age is, An infallible Church, or an infallible Book—which? Rome, for herself, has long since answered this question; it remains for Protestantism to answer it in an equally decisive and practical manner. This Protestantism, as the sequel will show, has never really done. The issue has, indeed, long been made up; only that part of the religious world called Protestant has not been quite ready for it. But now this question is fast becoming clamorous for a solution, and it will not be hushed even with the most specious sophistry. It demands to be tried upon its merits, and loudly inquires why judgment should not now be rendered, and the verdict be recorded upon the sober page of history. Are we ready for the trial?

Rome, always crafty, always wise in the wisdom of this world, always ready in most things to accommodate herself to countries, times, and men's manners, early recognized the fundamental truth, *that it is inherent in man's nature to demand infallibility in the matter of his religion.* Give him perfect confidence in his religious position; imbue him with the idea that his hope is well-founded; in a word, invest him with the clear and well-defined conviction that his religious faith, in whatever it may consist, or whatever may be its object, is infallible, and you bind him as in fetters of iron. A man morally and intellectually well-balanced, demands something in which he can infallibly trust; you can never satisfy him else. Nor is he to be blamed for this; it is but a reasonable demand of his spiritual nature. Rome, it is repeated, early recognized this most important fact; and in laying the foundations of that stupendous hierarchy, which is to-day both the wonder and the shame of the religious world, she had to choose between two alternatives. She reasoned somewhat after this fashion: Our adherents must be profoundly penetrated with the conviction that they are *secure.* We must give them confidence, permanence, infallibility; but *in what* shall this infallibility consist? This was the question that Rome had to meet more than twelve centuries ago; and wisely, as this world calls wisdom, did she meet it. *She gave to her people an infallible Church.* As between an infallible Church, or an infallible Book, she gave her people the former; and to this idea she most tenaciously adheres to this day. This is, in truth, the central, the fundamental, idea of Popery. Around this idea Romanism has gathered all her forces; around

this idea she has crystallized—solidified, so to speak—until she has become what we now see her to be. This idea of ecclesiastical infallibility is at once the secret of her success, her unity, and her power. Strike from Roman Catholicism this foundation doctrine of the Church's infallibility, and in that same moment, and by that same blow, you shall see the proud fabric crumble into dust! Every act, every subordinate article of faith, every pontifical edict, every synodical ordinance of Rome is in harmony with this controlling idea. And I conclude that he who has not so read her history has not read it aright. The Church is infallible; the Church can do no wrong; the Church can not err; these are the ligaments that even the sharp sword of war has no power to cut.

The unity of Rome, then, is the unity of a gigantic ecclesiasticism founded upon the central idea of the Church's infallibility. To preserve this idea intact, every thing else would be ruthlessly sacrificed. To preserve this idea intact, Rome will bend, will break, will concede, until all her characteristic features are changed. It is a well-known fact, susceptible of ocular demonstration, that the Romanism of France is not identical with that of Italy, except in this one particular. In this you shall find identity. However widely they differ in other matters, they are agreed in this; and *this* is the unity of which Rome so proudly boasts. It is, furthermore, well known that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is scarcely recognizable as the Roman Catholic Church in Spain, except in this, that in both countries alike they cling with the gripe of death to the doctrine of ecclesiastical infallibility. Austria may fling away the Concordat, and utterly disregard the most solemn obligations, but still the Church in Austria is bound to the chair of Saint Peter by the one bond of infallibility. France, and Austria, and Italy—all Roman Catholic powers—may be involved in most awful and sanguinary strife; thrones may be vacated, dynasties changed, crowns crumbled, and scepters broken, but still, in an ecclesiastical sense, all are held together by the strong tie of Church infallibility. The unity of Rome, then, is not the unity of the Spirit, nor is the bond that binds its several parts together the bond of peace; and it is not hence *such* a union as we desire to see obtain among the true Israel of God. But it has served the purpose for which it was designed. It has made monarchs, in abject humility, hold the stirrup while their

spiritual master mounted; and it has made other monarchs bare their necks to the pressure of the pontifical foot. It has made Rome the mightiest ecclesiasticism of earth. It binds millions in chains that may not be broken; and Protestantism might just as well shoot harmless arrows at the thunderbolts of Jove, hoping thereby to silence them, as to try to break the power of Rome without first dispossessing her adherents of the idea of the Church's infallibility. In this they most devoutly believe, and, believing it, they are as immovable as the everlasting hills. Indeed, they would be simpletons were they to yield their positions in what they believe to be an infallible Church, for the unsettled, half-hearted, broken, disjointed Protestantism of the nineteenth century. We, too, must give them something infallible. We do not desire to destroy the *idea* of infallibility, nor to remove it from their minds; but we do most ardently desire to give them *the true theory of infallibility*. It is not the *idea* of infallibility, but the *object* that we wish to change.

But where shall we find that for which we seek? Shall we find it among the contending sects of the Protestant world? Protestants indeed have the Book, but they understand not its value. They do not, in their various sects, illustrate the divine idea of unity as it respects the one Body; nor do they, if we may judge from the multiplication of human creeds, exhibit much confidence in what is popularly supposed to be, *par excellence*, the Protestant creed. The truth is, that the Bible is no more the exclusive creed of Protestantism than it is of Romanism. Both alike cling to the traditions of the "Fathers," and both alike trust to the *ex-cathedra* interpretation of uninspired men. Let the various Protestant sects of the day eliminate all that is human from their creeds, and conform their practice to the apostolic Churches, and were their respective founders to rise from the dead they would not recognize the children of their care.

The apostles had a standard by which they tried all men. The Gospel, the Church, the Ordinance, meant something. They had but one Gospel to preach. Belief in that Gospel, and obedience to its requirements, constituted men Christians. And these Christians constituted the one Body. Now, did the apostles ever promise salvation to men who refused to yield to its terms as contained in the Commission under whose sanctions they preached? Did they, in one word, ever promise salvation to any human being outside of *the*

Church of which they themselves were members? I most solemnly affirm that they never did! To the truth as they preached it; to the ordinances as they administered them; and to the Church, as they, by the Holy Spirit's aid, organized it, *they have bound the world!* Now apply these apostolic tests to the Protestant parties of the age.

Here are ten Protestant priests, representing ten Protestant factions. I approach the first. "Can I, sir, be saved, and not be a member of your Church, and without rendering obedience to the Gospel *as you preach it?*" He replies, "O, yes; I would not be so uncharitable as to say that you can not be saved in some *other* Church." Imagine an apostle of Jesus Christ employing this form of speech! Poor, deluded man! I presume that when, with a self-satisfied air, he has said this, he thinks that he has done charity a real service, whereas he has but strangled her in the house of her professed friends. This man represents a miserable faction called a church, outside the pale of which he confesses men can be saved. And so I address myself to each of the ten Protestant priests, and from each I receive the same answer. Each refers me to some other mythical establishment, in which salvation may be found. To be sure, it is to be found in *his* Church; but then it may also be obtained in some other Church radically different from his own! "Well," I again inquire, "is your Church infallible?" About all that he knows of the Roman Catholic Church is, that it claims to be infallible, and he must not be like a Roman Catholic in any thing, else he would not be a good Protestant; therefore he answers me readily, "No, sir; my Church is not infallible. It is made up of poor, sinful, erring men." I push my inquiries: "Is your *creed* infallible?" At a loss to know to which of his creeds I refer—the human or the divine—and remembering that Chillingworth once proclaimed that "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants," he determines, on this occasion at least, to select the Bible, and so he responds, "The Gospel is necessary, though of itself insufficient, to renew and sanctify the depraved hearts of men. The Gospel is necessary, though alone it can not purify man. The truths of revelation are not sufficient to save men. The Word of God, without the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit, which is distinct from it, and operates independently of it, has no power to save.

Without this abstract influence of the Holy Spirit, the Word of God is a dead letter."*

And thus does Protestantism bow her head to the dust, and from her all hope departs. It is weaker than Romanism in this, that while Rome utterly repudiates the doctrine of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, it tenaciously holds to the dogma of the Church's infallibility. The Church, at least, is sufficient and infallible. You may safely, and forever, trust in the Church. But the Protestant has neither an infallible Church, nor, in his judgment, an infallible Book. True, his creed may direct him in what it is right for him to do, but then he can not control his own volitions; and though he may *believe* right, still, in order to make his faith worth any thing, he must await the accompanying influence of an abstract agent, which he can not control. And herein we perceive the weakness of Protestantism. The Protestant can not implicitly trust his Church; it speaks not to him in tones calculated to beget confidence; and as for his creed—why, that is all well enough as an abstract question, but then he does not know how *far* to trust it, or how *much* to trust it. As for the momentous questions, "Am I saved *now?* Am I *infallibly right*, both in my faith and practice?" it is enough to say that he despairs of their being satisfactorily answered in this life. A life lived in harmony with *moral law* is the best evidence—and in a myriad of cases the only evidence—the Protestant has that he is a pardoned man. He hence lives in constant uncertainty and doubt, and eternally oscillates between hope and fear. There is no comfort in any such religion as this, and I marvel not, therefore, that thousands of persons of Protestant birth and culture incontinently throw themselves upon the soothing breast of "Holy Mother Church." She is, indeed, to such as believe in her, a cherishing mother. She says: "Come to my bosom, my children; in my embrace you shall find rest. I will care for you; I will nurse you; I will lead you infallibly right; you need never fear so long as you are true to your mother." Is it wonderful, then, that the potent spell of her witcheries binds millions to her heart? To my mind it is inconceivable how it could be otherwise.

Now, ask one of these same Papists if there is salvation outside the pale of his Church, and, if he be honest, he will startle you with

* These answers are written as given by a distinguished Presbyterian divine.

his deep and sonorous "No!" And I honor him for his answer. I honor any man who is thus rational and consistent, be he Roman Catholic, Pagan, or Protestant. Of one who is simply and only a Christian we expect no other answer.

"But," I said to a Papist only the other day, "you say that the Bible is not sufficient as a rule both of faith and practice; how do you supply the deficiency?" For the answer I was, of course, prepared: "We supply the deficiency with tradition." "Some one," I returned, "must determine as to the credibility and consequent value of tradition." "O, yes," enthusiastically exclaimed my friend, "Holy Mother Church will attend to that! Her judgment is infallible; she can not go astray!" "You believe this," said I. "Believe it! with all the energy of my soul!"

I should like to see a Protestant priest, with his six hundred and odd sects, and his six hundred and odd creeds in addition to the Bible, and *no* infallible Church to determine the good from the evil—I say that I should like to see such a priest undertake the "conversion" of such a devotee! Will he succeed? Yes; when the Ethiopian can change his skin, and the leopard his spots!

From my quiet office, in the heart of this great city, in which I write, I look out upon scores of vast temples, whose spires, piercing the blue heavens, are surmounted with the symbol of the Christian faith. I lay down my pen, and take a stroll. I reflect: It is possible that I am overworked, and nervous, and feverish, and may have drawn somewhat upon my imagination. I pass whole squares—squares in the most attractive and beautiful districts in the city—walled in with solid granite, inclosing vast piles consecrated to schools, nunneries, hospitals, monasteries, etc. Into these hives of human bees, old and young—but especially the young—rich and poor, high and low, black and white, foreigner and native, ignorant and learned, are swarming in countless numbers. Interminable processions of ecclesiastically-uniformed men and women, boys and girls, are constantly marching and countermarching upon the streets. The stately and measured tread of these serried ranks would not suffer in comparison with the trained movements of veteran warriors. Here are numbers, wealth, influence, social power—every thing that can give *éclat* to any organization. I gaze upon the imposing spectacle until I grow dizzy, and then I look down upon the shattered, broken,

contending sects of Protestantism, that lie almost helpless and impotent at the feet of this huge spiritual hierarchy, and I ask myself the question: "Why this amazing, this appalling disparity?" I find the answer in one word, and that word is—*infallibility!*

There is discipline here, there is tact here, there is craft here, there is spiritual despotism here; but, above all, in the unalterable belief of each one of this great army of souls, there is infallibility here! Like the spinal cord, this fact vitalizes, energizes, and holds the whole body erect; cut that cord, and helpless paralysis will supervene. The intense devotion to "mother Church," exhibited in the lives of her heterogeneous family, is easily explained on the ground of their unwavering confidence in her infallibility. I have called her family heterogeneous: heterogeneous they may be in all things else—homogeneous in this. Their mother offers them an asylum which they are fain to enter; she sings to them her sweetest lullaby; she hushes the sobs of her babes; she has the means of restoring confidence where confidence is wanting. Is "poor Carlotta" driven from her realm by a savage mob? She flies to the altars of the Church. Is Isabella hurled from her throne by an outraged and suffering people? She hastens to the shelter of the Church. Kings, potentates, beggars—all, all have this last resort. She takes unquestioned charge of the souls of her children while living, and gives their bodies no common sepulture when dead. And thus has it been from the beginning.

But with all the earnestness of which my nature is susceptible do I repudiate the claims and pretensions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. True, infallibility we must have somewhere, but I deny the pretended infallibility of Rome. It resides not in what I solemnly believe to be the "mystery of iniquity." The infallibility of Rome is a splendid lie—a gorgeous delusion. Nor shall we find the true idea of infallibility among the Protestant sects of the day, with the use that they make of the Bible. What, then, would I do? This I would do: I would emphasize, with the vehemence of fire, the necessity of infallibility, but I would seek for that infallibility elsewhere than in Rome, Geneva, or Oxford. I would seek for it—*and I should find it*—in the Bible, and the Bible ALONE! I would, with the voice of thunder, proclaim to all the world, "The Word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith

which we preach—that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For, with the heart, man believeth unto righteousness; and, with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation. . . . . For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? . . . So, then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Here is my charter, here my credentials. I would substitute the Bible for the ecclesiastical unity of Rome on the one hand, and broken, divided, spiritless Protestantism on the other. I would place the Bible first—I would place the Bible *above* all Churches. I would make it the supreme and only arbiter in things spiritual. I would place the Bible *before* all Churches. I would make the Bible, to every soul of our race, *what the Church is to the Papist.* I would supplant the Churches of men's creation with the revealed will of the eternal Jehovah. I would intrench humanity behind the Bible. I would make the Bible their bulwark and their defense, their covert from the storm, their garden of delight amidst the sterility of ecclesiastical deserts. I would say to mankind: The Bible is before all Churches. The Bible was *first,* then THE CHURCH followed. *Without the former the latter would have no existence.* Human oracles there may be, *but they are without* AUTHORITY. The fundamental—the central—truth of the Bible is the rock upon which the Church is built. The foundation had *first to be laid* before the superstructure called the Church could be built upon it. The central truth of the Christian system existed, and had been confessed by human lips, long before the institution—the only institution—that Jesus Christ ever recognized as HIS CHURCH, had any organized existence. And this truth was committed to men immediately from the lips of Jehovah! "Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you." The Church, then, is the light-bearer, the servant of the infallible truth. The Church is infallible only when it exists in perfect conformity to the truth. Only as it is built upon the truth, and molded in all respects after the Divine model, and animated by the very spirit that made known the truth, is the Church infallible. It will be safe to trust what men call the

Church just so far as it proves faithful to the truth, but no further. The Church is nothing to me when, either in its inception, its organization, its faith, or its practice, it deviates from the plain law of Christ. It is, to me then, a Church only in name. I can have, in such a case, no respect for its authority, no confidence in its pretensions, and no reverence for its history. It is nothing more to me then than any other human institution containing, it may be, a certain per centum of diluted truth. That is all. But for the Church established upon the truth, and supported by the truth—such a Church, for example, as that whose history is recorded in the Acts of Apostles, and which began in Jerusalem—I have respect, I have reverence, and in it I have the profoundest confidence. And if you ask me, "Is there salvation outside the pale of *this* Church?" I hesitate not to answer—I blush not to answer—"No!"

This Church is not a sect among sects; it is not a denomination among denominations; it is not to be—it can not be—measured by human standards. Its origin, its foundation, its laws, its ordinances, its very name, are all divine. The seal and authority of Almighty God are upon them all. Such a Church *is* infallible, but only then because the truth has made it so. There is no human manipulating, no bartering, no exchanging, no selling of birthrights in such a Church. What the truth of God binds is bound; what his truth makes free is free indeed.

Do you, as a Protestant, marvel at the devotion of that poor, ignorant Papist? Do you wonder that that servant girl will rise from her hard bed at four o'clock of a cold winter morning, and seek her confessional before you think of leaving your luxurious couch? Do you wonder that, out of the scanty wages paid by you and your class to this same servant girl, arise those magnificent cathedrals, churches, colleges, hospitals, asylums—all over the land? Marvel not. It is because this girl *believes* in what she is doing. She was taught it by her peasant-mother before her. She believes in the infallibility of her Church; she believes that her Church has power to save her; and believing, *she shows her faith by her works.* Chide not this girl until you are able to show her a more excellent way. When you make the Bible take the place in your heart that the Church has taken in the heart of this poor girl; when you teach your children to trust in and reverence the Word of God, as this

girl's mother taught her to trust in and reverence the Church; when you teach yourself and teach your children to believe that the salvation of this lost and ruined world depends upon the reception of the truth as it is in Jesus; then, but not till then, will there be a corresponding effort on your part to show *your* faith by *your* works. This girl shall then find a powerful rival in her mistress!

Finally. What is your child doing in that Papal school? Would the Papist send *his* child to *your* school? He would sooner see it immolated upon an altar of fire! And in this, according to his faith, he acts wisely. I commend his wisdom as worthy your Protestant consideration and imitation! The Papist manages to induce all his children to go with him. Do you enjoy a corresponding influence over *your* children? Is your family a united family, as is the family of the Papist? These are momentous questions for the Protestant of this day to solve, but solved they must be.

Are you able to feel the sting in the following words of "Pius, Sovereign Pontiff, Ninth of the Name, to all Protestants and non-Catholics?" In speaking of the multitudinous sects of the Protestant world, and of the restlessness, instability, and uncertainty that every-where characterizes Protestantism, he says:

"Every one can easily comprehend that this state of things is altogether opposed to the Church established by Christ our Lord, a Church in which the truth must always rest unaltered, without being the subject of any change, as a charge intrusted to the same Church in order that she may preserve it in all its integrity, a charge for the care of which the presence of the Holy Ghost, and its aid, has been granted forever to this Church. No one can ignore the fact that these differences of doctrine and opinion give rise to the social schisms, and that therefrom spring these innumerable sects and communions which are daily increasing, to the detriment of Christian and civil society. Whoever, in fact, recognizes religion as the foundation of human society can not refuse to admit and avow the influence exercised over civilized society by those divisions, and disagreements of principles of that nature, and of religious societies, struggling one with the other; and also with what power and denial of authority established by God to regulate the conviction of the human intelligence, and to direct the actions of men, both in their social and private life, has excited, has developed, and has fomented those most unfortunate troubles, those events, and those disturbances which agitate and affect almost all nations in a most deplorable manner."

The very fact that the Pope of Rome should, in the last half of the nineteenth century, have occasion to pen such a paragraph, ought to call the blush of shame to every Protestant cheek! Protestantism has been experimenting for three hundred years, and the Pope of

Rome has summed up the result! Let Protestantism try the force of its logic upon this Papal dilemma!

In Christ's dear name, let us have done with our sectarian and party strife! If we really believe in the Bible, then let us take the Bible. Let us give it its true position. Let us place the Bible above every thing else, and then, in *all things*, conform ourselves to its teaching. Let us throw away our human creeds; let us disband our schismatical religious societies; let us all henceforth speak the same things; and let divisions cease among us forever! Let us confidently and wholly rely upon the infallible truth of God's Word. This can not err; this can not mislead us; this will never deceive us. Its accents fall with amazing power upon men's hearts. The calm precision of its statements is truly wonderful. More unhesitating in its utterances than the Delphic Oracle, its every word is clothed with the majesty and authority of the living God!

IV.—RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

IN the wide domain of the universe there are no contradictions. Often we come upon what seem to be such, but they are only seeming—the fruit of our ignorance. More extended and careful research, leading to higher generalizations, always brings order out of chaos—thus illustrating the trite maxim, "*The exception proves the rule.*" The proposition needs no argument, and the man who demands it is the very one that is not satisfied when it is given. The thought enters into the very conception of a God. Revelation says, the universe is one; so does Science. In the words of Scripture, "*God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.*"

Accordingly, the spiritual and natural worlds can not antagonize. Both are of God. Neither can the Scriptures and Science, provided the former be a genuine religious voice, and the latter a true interpretation of nature. Terms are here used in their absolute sense. Reference is not made to the exegesis of any particular sect, or to the theories of any particular school, but to the thought of God expressed in revelation and in creation. If the thoughts of the Bible and the thoughts of nature are God's thoughts, then there can be no antagonisms. St. Augustine stated the Christian hypothesis thus: "*Duo sunt que in cognitionem Dei ducunt, Creatura et Scriptura*—There are two which lead to a knowledge of God, Creation and the Scriptures." Nature and the Bible are respectively the older and the younger Scriptures; they are two Testaments by the same author. The pages of both are divine, because they are traced by the same Divine hand. The Christian hypothesis is a proper subject of investigation, but, in the present discussion, it is not to be called in question.

Thus far there is no difficulty; but so soon as we pass beyond the absolute into the realm of Biblical interpretation and scientific theory, what a strife! What a babel of discordant voices! However it may be with other fields of mental activity, men of religion and men of science are not at peace. It is our purpose to inquire into some of the causes of this strife—to explain why confusion has

usurped the seat of order—to show why discord reigns instead of concord—to account for contradiction in the place of harmony. The point of departure already indicated is that, absolutely, there is no antagonism.

We shall first state the principal condition of peace between men of faith and men of science. Faith has a distinct province, and so has reason; Religion has a realm in the universe, and so has Science. This being agreed to, the boundary line between the two provinces must be drawn with at least *tolerable distinctness.* Furthermore, when drawn, this line must be respected. Neither the theologian nor the philosopher must assert a claim to the whole spiritual empire. The theologian must not invade, with his method of thought, the kingdom of the sciences, nor must the philosopher make incursions with his into the kingdom of grace. The one must yield ample room for scientific inquiry; the other must leave some space for faith. Each must acknowledge that there is more than one kind of knowledge. Man must be left with both a Religion and a Science,* otherwise, his spiritual equipment will be incomplete. We hope to make the truth of all these propositions appear as we proceed.

Those who know any thing of the past know there has been a hotly waged conflict between Religion and Science; those who keep abreast of the present, know that it still goes on, and that it loses none of its intensity. That this strife has resulted, and is constantly resulting disastrously to both Science and Religion, is believed by many who are entitled to an opinion. Now, if reason and faith have different though intimately related spheres, if we may rightfully have both a science and a religion, why should this be? Where does the responsibility rest? We do not conceal the fact that the collision grows, in part, out of the inherent difficulty of the subject; out of the difficulty of defining the limits of religious and scientific knowledge; out of the difficulty of determining where we should walk by faith, and where by sight. But this concession, even when pushed

*"Science has a foundation, and so has Religion; let them unite their foundations, and the basis will be broader, and they will be two compartments of one great fabric, reared to the glory of God. Let the one be the outer and the other the inner court. In the one let all look, and admire, and adore; and in the other, let those who have faith kneel and pray, and praise. Let the one be the sanctuary where human learning may present its richest incense as an offering to God; and the other, the holiest of all, separated from it by a vail now rent in twain, and in which, on a blood-sprinkled mercy-seat, we pour out the love of a reconciled heart, and hear the oracles of the living God."—*M'Cosh.*

to the farthest extreme, does not account for the imbittered feeling that has attended the great debate, or for the contrariety of opinion. There is a personal responsibility; and this we charge in about equal measure upon the theologians and the philosophers. The former are too fearful, jealous, and bigoted; the latter, too pretentious and arrogant. The former have sought to restrict, unduly, the range of scientific investigation—ceaselessly crying out, Hands off! The latter have ignored the religious nature of man, and have sought to annihilate faith. The theologian has trenched on the field of science; the scientist has denied that there is more than one kind of knowledge. The former has sought to cover the universe with his texts; the latter with his natural laws. Thus neither party has respected the primal condition of fraternity.

Of course many great names can be mentioned that are exceptions to these broad generalizations—names of theologians, characterized by an ardent love of science rather than by the *odium theologicum;* names of philosophers, characterized by a deep and beautiful faith in religion rather than by pride of opinion. But these honorable exceptions do not atone for the errors of their respective classes. For some centuries, unless we read history amiss, the theological spirit and the scientific spirit have been opposed to each other. To sustain this position, we shall pass in review some of the more interesting and important facts touching the controversy. As we write in a Christian magazine, we shall be careful that the champion of the faith does not go unwhipped of justice.

1. *Astronomy.*—Along with her other legacies, Pagan antiquity bequeathed to the Christian Church a science of the stars. This science was almost wholly the creation of a few great minds, who were trained in the schools of Alexandria, and who, in turn, reflected upon those schools the splendor of their own achievements. It was the matured fruit of many generations' observation and thought. Of all the great scientific names that adorn the history of the Grecian capital of Egypt, perhaps the greatest is that of Ptolemy, the astronomer and geographer, who lived in the second century. He is known to the astronomical science of to-day as the author of two great discoveries—that of the moon's evection, and that of the planetary motions—but from his own day to the seventeenth century he was the honored author of the received science of Astronomy. It

was Ptolemy who organized into a theory the discoveries of the Alexandrian astronomers. Thus, for sixteen hundred years, he stood before the world the author of a great system; and the authors of great systems, let it be remembered, are ever stars of the first magnitude in the intellectual horizon. Ptolemy's great work, called, in Greek, "The Syntaxis," was known to the Arabian philosophers as "The Almagest;" and this was the name that passed with the work to Christian Europe. The central doctrine of the Ptolemaic astronomy was this: The earth is fixed in space, while the sun and the planets revolve around it. This theory—now called *geocentric*, because it makes the earth (*gee*) the center of the system—was warmly embraced by the Church of the middle ages. The reasons are obvious: 1. It was held by the best intellects of Europe; 2. It appeared to harmonize with the language of the Scriptures; 3. It was flattering to theological pride of opinion. Accordingly, the Aristotelian Church doctors regarded the "Almagest" in the light of an authoritative commentary on the Bible. To them the earth was the center of the solar system as certainly as Christ was the center of the Christian system, or as certainly as the Pope was the successor of St. Peter. The theory was not held as a doctrine of science, to be abandoned if the progress of discovery should demand it, but as an article of religious faith, worthy of all acceptation. There were some individuals who did not thus regard it, but they were the exceptions. To this day the infallible Latin Church stands committed, on the pages of history, to Ptolemy. One of the inconveniences of an infallible body is that it can never modify or retract its decisions; an inconvenience that the more enlightened Catholics must sometimes feel.

Having sufficiently characterized the received Astronomy at the time of the great intellectual awakening that ushered in the Modern Era, and having stated the position of the Church with respect to it, we must next trace the steps by which the mind of Europe emancipated itself from this venerable error, and point out the course the Church pursued with reference to that emancipation. We note the fact that with the introduction of the Modern Era begins the long and acrimonious struggle which we so deeply deplore.

Nicholas Copernicus was born in the City of Thorn, Poland, in 1473. He was the man who overthrew the geocentric astronomy. He was by profession a priest. In his early life he studied medicine

and mathematics; subsequently he applied himself to the study of the heavens. He was soon struck with the great and increasing complexity of the Ptolemaic system, and as early as 1507 came to the conclusion that nature follows simple laws. Copernicus had, in a marked degree, one of the characteristics of the great natural philosopher: he was patient and indefatigable. He reviewed every known system of Astronomy, and finally adopted the *heliocentric* theory—that which makes the sun (*helios*) the center of the planetary system. It was not until he had spent more than thirty years in observation and reflection that he consented to publish the work in which his views were developed—a fact that contains a salutary lesson for hasty theorizers. His *De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium* was published in 1543; its author received the first printed copy on his death-bed but a few hours before he breathed his last. A monument to his memory with an inscription taken from the Latin version of the Book of Joshua, "STA, SOL, NE MOVEARE," stands in the city of Cracow.

The extreme humility of this great mind in stating the discoveries that have immortalized his name is proof of the low estimation in which science was held in his generation; it is proof, as well, of the far-reaching influence of the hierarchy. He said, in his preface:

"Then I too began to meditate on the motions of the earth, and, though it appeared an absurd opinion, yet, since I knew that in previous times others had been allowed the privilege of feigning what circle they chose in order to explain the phenomena, I concluded that I might take the liberty of trying whether, on the supposition of the earth's motion, it was possible to find better explanations than the ancient ones of the revolutions of the celestial orbs. . . . Though I know that the thoughts of a philosopher do not depend on the judgment of the many, his study being to seek out truth in all things as far as is permitted by God to human reason, yet, when I considered how absurd my doctrines would appear, I long hesitated whether I should publish my book, or whether it were not better to follow the example of Pythagoras and others, who delivered their doctrines only by tradition and to friends."

This is the pass to which things come when the Church assumes to be an authoritative expounder of philosophy. But Copernicus concluded his preface in a worthier strain:

"If there be vain babblers, who, knowing nothing of mathematics, yet assumed the right of judging on account of some place in Scripture perversely wrested to their purpose, and who blame and attack my undertaking, I heed them not, and look upon their judgment as rash and contemptible."

As we have implied, the Polish philosopher did not live to witness the strife that his work created. The heliocentric theory did not at once meet defiant opposition. Copernicus was a Catholic and a priest; he even dedicated the *De Revolutionibus* to the Pope. But so soon as it began to attract attention the thunders of the Church were let loose. Giordano Bruno, author of a work on the Plurality of Worlds, contributed largely to its introduction into England. But Bruno was a heretic as well as a man of science. The Inquisition pursued him with insatiable malignity, and as much because he was a disciple of Copernicus as because he disbelieved the doctrine of transubstantiation. Falling at length into the hands of his priestly enemies, he was handed over to the civil authorities, to be punished "as mercifully as possible, and without the shedding of blood"—the hypocritical formula with which the Holy Inquisition sent men to the stake. Bruno was burned at Rome, in 1600. As sentence was pronounced upon him, he said: "Perhaps it is with greater fear that ye pass this sentence upon me than I receive it." We are indebted to this deistical philosopher for the invaluable thought that the Scriptures were not intended to teach science, *but morals only.*

But the heliocentric astronomy continued to gain ground on all sides. Its great expounders* in the seventeenth century were Galileo, Kepler, Newton, and Milton—the three former in great scientific treatises, the latter in a great epic poem. We must now notice the conflict of Galileo with the hierarchy.

Galileo was born in Pisa, Italy, in 1564,; he adopted the Copernican theory in the last decade of the sixteenth century. The pressure of public opinion may be inferred from the fact that even he, chivalrous as he was, for some years concealed (as he confesses in a letter to Kepler) his opinions. But early in the next century we find him publicly committed to the new doctrine. He constructed a telescope, and with it made the most surprising discoveries. These we can not so much as name, but they are written on the most

* We regret that we can not add to these illustrious names that of Bacon. This philosopher spurned the heliocentric astronomy. He seems not to have sympathized with the real scientific work of his age. "He rejected the Copernican system, and spoke insolently of its great author; he undertook to criticise adversely Gilbert's treatise, 'De Magnete;' he was occupied in the condemnation of any investigation of final causes, while Harvey was deducing the circulation of the blood from Aquapendenti's discovery of the valves in the veins; he was doubtful whether instruments were of any advantage while Galileo was investigating the heavens with the telescope."—*Draper.*

brilliant pages of the history of science. The Church was now thoroughly aroused. In 1616, Copernicus, although more than sixty years in his grave, was formally condemned as a heretic; the Inquisition pronounced his system "that false Pythagorean doctrine, utterly contrary to the Holy Scriptures." The works of Copernicus, of Galileo, of Kepler, were put on the *Index Expurgatorius*. Galileo was cited before the Holy Office. Remembering the fate of Bruno, he recanted, and promised to remain silent. But the truth within him again found a voice; in 1632 he published a new work, more obnoxious to the Church than any that had preceded it. Again he was cited before the Inquisition; again his spirit failed him;* again he recanted. The aged and enfeebled philosopher, attired in a garment of disgrace, was compelled to fall on his knees before the assembled cardinals, and abjure the heliocentric doctrine; he was then committed to prison; those who had aided in printing his book were punished; his friends were publicly disgraced. After a short imprisonment he was permitted to go to Florence, but only to be confined in his own house, subject to continual indignities. In 1637 he lost his eyesight—shortly after, he became deaf. In his blindness he was visited by the young English Republican, John Milton, who, like Galileo, after performing the most substantial services for humanity, was, like him, to end his days in the midst of contumely and reproach, in sorrow and in darkness. Says an eloquent historian:

"He died, January, 1642, in the 78th year of his age, the prisoner of the Inquisition. True to its instincts, that infernal institution followed him beyond the grave, disputing his right to make a will, and denying him burial in consecrated ground. The Pope also prohibited his friends from raising to him a monument in the Church of Santa Croce, in Florence. It was reserved for the nineteenth century to erect a suitable memorial in his honor."

Again, we say, this is the pass to which we come when the Church, forgetting her own divinely-appointed mission, presumes to pronounce authoritatively on scientific questions. Galileo, like Bruno, had the clearness of vision to see that Religion and Science have different functions. He repeatedly declared that the Scriptures were not given as a scientific authority, but only for our salvation. This suggestive truth was afterwards treasured as it deserved to be.

* There seems no sufficient evidence to prove that Galileo said, as he rose from his knees, "But still it moves."

We must now pay some attention to the weapons employed by the defenders of the geocentric astronomy. The pressure of public opinion, the rigors of the Inquisition, the anathemas of the Pope, have already been referred to; but it must not be supposed that the Church evoked only ecclesiastical thunders. Argument was resorted to. Let us form a distinct idea of the grounds on which Galileo was condemned. He was charged, 1. With holding that the sun is the center of the planetary system; he was charged, 2. With holding that the earth revolves around the sun, thus despising in both cases the teaching of the Bible. To disprove these propositions consumed the larger share of the Church's intellectual activity. The principal arguments are isolated texts* of Scripture, which—some of them the metaphors of poetry and rhetoric, some of them the ordinary phrases of common conversation—were construed with the most literal exactness. The heliocentric doctrine was condemned, not because it was unscientific, but because it was impious. A certain sarcastic Dominican hurled a sermon at Galileo from the text: "*Viri Galilæi, quid statis adspicientes in Cœlum?*—Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" But Scripture texts were not the only arguments. The doctors made pretensions to science; but their scientific arguments are not worth the recording. We give a whimsical specimen. To disprove the statement made by Galileo, that Jupiter had satellites, a Paduan professor held that since there were only seven metals, seven days in the week, seven apertures in a man's head, there could be only seven planets!†

*The following are specimens: The sun is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race; The sun knoweth his going down; The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down; The world also is established that it can not be moved; Who laid the foundations of the earth that it should not be moved forever? Thou hast established the earth, and it abideth; They continue to this day according to thine ordinances.

† The September number of *The National Quarterly* contains an article on Copernicus. The writer declares his purpose in writing it to be, 1. "To show that Copernicus was a much more profound and original thinker than he is generally regarded at the present day;" 2. "To show how unjust and ungenerous it is to brand as the enemies of science a body of men (the Roman clergy) who . . . have given us, through one of the most unassuming of their brethren, the noble system of the universe which is now universally received." All the facts on which the writer relies to accomplish the latter purpose are stated in the following paragraph: "Thus, we are bound to admit as beyond all dispute, that not only was the system of the universe now universally received founded by a priest of the Church which is said to be an enemy of science, but that it was a bishop and cardinal of the same Church who, above all others, took most pains to have the system promulgated to the world. It was, in fact, they who paid all the expenses of printing the

But it must not be imagined that the Romish ecclesiastics only opposed the heliocentric theory. The purely ecclesiastical spirit is ever the same, whether found in Rome, in Geneva, or in London. Protestant divines were scarcely more pervious to the light than the Catholics; but, from the nature of the case, they could appeal only to argument and denunciation. Their great cry, too, was, "The Scriptures are endangered!" Voetius, a great Dutch divine, who lived in the middle of the seventeenth century, declared: "This we affirm, that is, that the earth rests, and the sun moves around it, with all divines, natural philosophers, Jews and Mohammedans, Greeks and Latins, excepting one or two of the ancients and the modern followers of Copernicus." Heideggeri, a Swiss theologian, who flourished about half an age later, gave the same view, "from which," he said, "our pious reverence for the Scriptures, the word of truth, will not allow us to depart." "Turretine," says Hugh Miller, "was one of the most accomplished theologians of his age; nor is that age by any means a remote one. Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and Galileo had all finished their labors; . . . nay, at the time when his work issued from the Amsterdam press, (1695,) Isaac Newton had attained his fifty-third year; and fully ten years previous Prof. David Gregory, nephew of the inventor of the Gregorian telescope, had begun to teach, from his chair in the University of Edinburgh, the doctrine of gravitation and the true mechanism of the heavens, as unfolded in the Newtonian philosophy." And yet Turretine held the astronomical notions advocated by the persecutors of Galileo early in the century; he defended them with precisely the same arguments.

But, in time, the churchly opposition to the new astronomy ceased. The Ptolemaic theory fell into contempt, and the Copernican was installed in the place it had so long occupied. As in the case of every other true theory, every new discovery adds fresh

work; and finally it was to the head of the Church the work was dedicated; nor was it dedicated to the Pope without his having given full permission; and it is further proved that Paul III had not given this permission till he had made himself acquainted with the character of the work." Admitting that the facts are not all on one side, we must hold that those we have given are decisive of the temper of the Roman hierarchy. But our author condescends to do the work of an apologist. He says, "*It so happened* that a decree was issued from the Vatican the 5th of March, 1616, condemning the great work of Copernicus," etc. This is putting it mildly. We wonder if "it so happened" that Bruno was burned? if "it so happened" that continued indignities were heaped upon Galileo?

confirmation; and yet, even in our own day, ignorant prejudice against it is sometimes found. The arguments used by scholars and theologians two hundred years ago are still sometimes found in the mouths of the illiterate; soon they must fall below even their level.*

It is deserving of remark, ere this branch of the discussion is dismissed, that the Church had an authoritative geography as well as an authoritative astronomy. In the reign of Justinian, in the first half of the sixth century, there lived, in an Alexandrian monastery, an old monk named Cosmas. For that age he was an extensive traveler; he had an inquisitive mind, and made some pretensions to scientific attainments. This old monk gave to Europe a geography that endured for a thousand years. His book, written to expose the conceived errors of the Manichæans concerning the Antipodes, was called, *Topographia Christiana*, or, *Christian Opinion Concerning the World.* Cosmas described it as a "Christian topography of the universe, established by demonstrations from Divine Scriptures, concerning which it is not lawful to doubt." Just as though it was the office of the Holy Spirit to teach men geography! The notions of Cosmas are thus stated by an able historian of opinions:

"The world is a flat parallelogram. Its length, which should be measured from east to west, is the double of its breadth, which should be measured from north to south. In the center is the earth we inhabit, which is surrounded by the ocean, and this again is encircled by another earth, in which man lived before the Deluge, and from which Noah was transported in the ark. To the north of the world is a high, conical mountain, around which the sun and moon continually revolve. When the sun is hid behind the mountain, it is night; when it is on our side of the mountain, it is day. To the edge of the outer earth the sky is glued. It consists of four high walls, rising to a great hight, and then meeting in a vast concave roof, thus forming an immense edifice, of which our world is the

* A recent number of *Harper's Monthly Magazine* contains an article entitled, "South-Coast Saunterings in England." The writer describes the geologist, Pengelly, and relates these anecdotes: "Mr. Pengelly related many amusing adventures that he and other geologists had met during their researches in the neighborhood, arising chiefly from the horror which the country clergymen had of them. A flint arrow acted on these divines as a red rag on a bull. On one occasion he had visited a poor stone-breaker, whom he found conversing with the parish clergyman. When he showed the poor man a flint arrow-head, and asked him if he had met with such in his work, the parson raised his eyes and hands and rushed from the room. We sometimes fancy that the age in which Galileo vainly tried to persuade the Paduan professors to look through his telescope, which revealed the moons of Jupiter, has passed; but there are several places in Great Britain where that age survives. When Lord Rosse's great telescope was completed, two religious fanatics managed to get near it, and were caught in the act of breaking one of its lenses with a stone."

floor. This edifice is divided into two stories by the firmament, which is placed between the earth and the roof of the sky. A great ocean is inserted in the side of the firmament remote from the earth. This is what is signified by the waters that are above the firmament. The space from these waters to the roof of the sky is allotted to the blest; that from the firmament to our earth, to the angels, in their character as ministering spirits."

As the writer from whom we quote observes, "The reader will probably not regard these opinions as prodigies of scientific wisdom;" but the Church clung to them with a tenacity equaled only by that with which she clung to the Ptolemaic astronomy. To sustain this geographical system, passages from the Bible were quoted in which the "face of the earth" is mentioned; also those comparing the heavens to a "tabernacle." Cosmas had said a Christian with such passages before him should not "even speak of the Antipodes!" Some of the mediæval theologians were so liberal as to hold—as Basil and Ambrose had done in an earlier generation—that the subject should not be connected with salvation; but these could not stem the great stream of ignorance and bigotry that swept past them.

These notions of geography—the fancies of a dark age, the conceits of an old monk—greatly interfered with the progress of truth; they also retarded the progress of geographical discovery. When that sublime visionary, Columbus, applied to the king of Spain for means to undertake a voyage of discovery, a council of doctors was called, to meet at Salamanca. This council represented the learning and the science of the Spanish nation. The great Genoese spoke to an august assembly; but when he brought forward his arguments for the sphericity of the earth they were received with derisive incredulity. What, had not the monk Cosmas Idocupleustes disposed of the Antipodes nine hundred years before, by demanding how, in the day of judgment, men on the other side of the globe could see the Lord coming in the clouds? The doctors of Salamanca confuted the globular theory by quotations from the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Prophecies, the Gospels, the Epistles, and the writings of the Fathers. It was pronounced heretical. Columbus's proposed undertaking received no encouragement from the Spanish ecclesiastics. Despite the aid given by the king, it must have failed, had not the Pizons, an old and wealthy seafaring family, embarked in the enterprise. The discovery of a new world beyond three thou-

sand miles of sea was a severe blow to the patristic geography; but it was not until the San Vittoria, Magellan's ship, had circumnavigated the globe (1519–21) that it was completely shattered. The story of that stern and heroic navigator we can not tell; a single sentence will show the man's spirit:

> "But, though the Church hath evermore, from Holy Writ, affirmed that the earth should be a wide-spread plain, bordered by the waters, yet he comforted himself when he considered that in the eclipses of the moon the shadow-cast of the earth is round; and as is the shadow, such, in like manner, is the substance."

"It was a stout heart," says an historian, "a heart of triple brass, which could thus, against such authority, extract unyielding faith from a shadow!"

We have thus seen the Church, in both the Latin and Protestant branches, in a totally false position; we have seen it maintaining that position with the greatest obstinacy. It is but natural to inquire, How came the Church to champion the geography of Cosmas and the astronomy of Ptolemy? Some may say it was owing to the darkness of the age. So, in part, it was. But we can not thus explain why the Church was the very citadel of darkness. Specifically, then, the reason was this: The Church held a wrong view of the office of the Scriptures, asserting that they were given to teach science as well as salvation. The Roman Church is still historically committed to the Ptolemaic system; but practically, this erroneous conception of the office of the Bible, at least in the case of astronomy, is universally abandoned. The Church now adopts the canon of Bruno and Galileo, that the Scriptures were not intended to teach philosophy, but salvation only. This great controversy has passed wholly into history. It is now a burnt-out volcano; the ashes and lava once thrown from the crater are now cold. It is now seen that a man can be a disciple of Copernicus and a disciple of Jesus at the same time. The Church has lost nothing, but gained much, by the revolution. The descriptions of astronomical phenomena found in the Bible are not stumbling blocks to the feet of any who are pressing to the Cross. Besides, the new astronomy furnishes some of the most impressive and beautiful of the natural theologian's arguments and illustrations. The popular thought has crystallized in the proverb, "The undevout astronomer is mad." So far from

the astronomical allusions in the Bible standing in the way of the work of evangelization, Mitchel, the lamented patriot and soldier, the profound philosopher and faithful Christian, has undertaken to show that it is only by means of the discoveries of modern astronomy that some of these allusions can be understood.*

The discussion of this topic has extended beyond our expectations; but we can afford the space, if we have established the proposition, that it is madness to contend for a literal construction of a text when that construction is opposed to mathematical demonstration. Reviewing, then, this long and heated strife, we are compelled to say—although the innovating philosophers were guilty of some indiscretions, of some slight intemperance of language—*the chief responsibility rests with the theologians.* We now pass to a second topic.

II. *Geology.*—We can not hope to make this topic so interesting as the one just dismissed, and for two reasons: 1. The geological controversy is more recent than the astronomical, and the materials are, therefore, not so fresh; 2. It is impossible to group the facts touching it around three or four leading actors, illustrious alike for their discoveries and for their sufferings in the cause of knowledge. There are none who stand to geology in the relation in which Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler stood to astronomy.

The old traditionary idea of the creation held by the Church, was this: About six thousand years ago, in a few days' time, God made the universe, with all its furniture, very much as an artisan turns out toys in his work-shop. But soon after the intellectual awakening from that thousand years' sleep, called in history the middle ages, some adventurous spirits began, in the spirit of science, to investigate the physical history of our globe. We may remark, in passing, that they did not receive the sympathy and the countenance of the Church. But so slow was the growth of physical knowledge, that geology did not take rank as an important science until the last quarter of the eighteenth century. It was then applied to practical purposes by Werner, a professor in a Saxon school of Mines.

* He contends that such passages as the following have waited for an age of scientific discovery to disclose their full meaning: He hangeth the earth upon nothing; he sitteth upon the circle of the earth; hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth? where is the way where light dwelleth, and as for darkness, where is the place thereof? See *Astronomy of the Bible.*

Werner held that the strata of the earth's crust were precipitated from a common menstruum, or "chaotic fluid," which had, in his conception, covered the globe in a remote period. This was called the Neptunian or aqueous theory. Hutton, a contemporary geologist, of Edinburgh, Scotland, held that these strata were the work of fire. This was called the Plutonic or igneous theory. These two men were the founders of two rival schools of geology, between which there raged a war angry as the waves of Werner's sea—intense as the heat of Hutton's fiery abyss. But fuller knowledge led to a broader generalization, and to a settlement of the controversy. It finally appeared that Werner's theory was true of the rocks with which he was familiar in Germany, while Hutton's was true of the formations which he had studied in Scotland. Thus a third theory was formed, by blending the Neptunian and Plutonic. Some of the rocks, it was decided, had a watery, others a fiery, origin. This conclusion has now been unquestioned for half a century. But traces of water and of fire were not the only things found in the rocks; fossil remains of plants and animals—some of living, but many more of perished, species—were found in plentiful profusion. We can not even mention all that is written on the pages of the stony book, nor pause to describe the immense labor expended in learning to read the record. Suffice it to say, all men, whose opinions are entitled to the least consideration, concede that the young science of geology rests on stable foundations. It is not held that it ranks, in point of completeness, with astronomy, nor that there is no uncertainty in some of its theories, nor that all its conclusions are to pass unquestioned; but its facts are admitted, and the legitimacy of its method of argument conceded. We now turn to the theological bearings of the science of geology.

All men, who even so much as looked into the stony records, were impressed with the earth's great antiquity. The life of man, they saw, was short, but the world into which he was born, the theater of his activities, his receptacle when the fitful fever of life was over, reached back over illimitable ages, to the very morning of time. We may take one glance at the steps of this progressive creation. First of all, a nebulous fire-mist, then a sea of liquid fire, then a thick crust of fire-rock, then the condensation of aqueous vapor into water, then the erosions of water and sedimentary deposits, then

vegetable and animal life—first in simpler, next in complexer forms—all these attended by upheavals of the bottom of the sea, followed by depressions of continents, until at last, in the ends of the ages, man stood forth, formed in the image of God, the acknowledged superior of all the creations that had gone before him. Truly it was an amazing revelation! Who can wonder that men hesitated long before they received it?

Long before these positions were incontrovertibly established, the Church had taken the alarm. As we have seen, the early inquirers had not had her sympathy—the later ones experienced her sore displeasure. The ecclesiastics had learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Instead of learning wisdom from their previous encounter with the astronomers, they again took a position of antagonism. Affrighted, they cried out, "What is to become of Moses?" Instead of waiting to see whereunto this thing should grow, they condemned it in advance. Instead of inquiring whether the Mosaic account of creation would bear a construction different from that so long placed upon it, they said, "The geologists must be wrong." Geologizing infidels, hailing the opportunity to form an issue, promptly raised the shout, "Geology and the Scriptures are at variance! Moses is a liar! The Bible is false!" Thus theologians and geologists rushed into positions of entire antagonism, thereby putting religion in a false light on the one hand, and prejudicing the claims of the young science on the other. But there were, fortunately, a few dispassionate theologians, and a few moderate geologists, who mediated between the extremists, and paved the way for a reconciliation between religion and geology. We can not do more than give the clew that led honest inquirers out of the labyrinth:

In 1804, Thomas Chalmers, then an obscure young man, engaged in lecturing at St. Andrews, Scotland, took the ground that the writings of Moses do not fix the date of the earth's creation. He further alleged that, for aught we knew to the contrary, there may have elapsed, between the first creative act and the first day of Moses, an immense interval. His words were these:

"There is a prejudice against the speculations of geologists, which I am anxious to remove. It has been said that they nurture infidel propensities. It has been alleged that geology, by referring the origin of the globe to a higher antiquity than is assigned to it in the writings of Moses, undermines our faith

in the inspiration of the Bible, and of all the animating prospects of the immortality which it unfolds. This is a false alarm. *The writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe.*"

Finally, the geological evidence became so strong that it could no longer be resisted. Theologians were forced to heed it. Making a virtue of necessity, they reëxamined critically the Mosaic records. They now saw that Dr. Chalmers was right when he said the writings of Moses do not fix the globe's antiquity. Their heavy hearts were further lightened by the discovery that the same position had been held by some of the most eminent commentators and critics* centuries before geologists had laid the corner-stone of their science.

But this was disposing of only one difficulty. We state a further one, which gave far more trouble to those seeking to harmonize geology and revelation. The study of fossils had given rise to these questions: How shall the history of the Creation given by Moses be reconciled, page by page, with that given by Geology? Is there evidence in the rocks of creative periods corresponding to the six demiurgic days of Genesis? The limits of this article will not permit so much as a history of the discussion to which these questions led, much less a critical examination of the various theories of reconciliation that have been suggested. We can merely outline the theory that is now most prominent. It is substantially that of which the lamented Miller was the most illustrious champion. The query was raised: Does the language used in Genesis force us to the conclusion that the six demiurgic days were days of twenty-four hours? A closer study of the text led the best scholars to the conclusion that the word rendered day might mean an extended period. In many other passages it obviously had that signification. Here again the modified interpretation had the weighty authority of some early commentators. Among the Jews, Josephus and Philo had regarded the six days as metaphorical. Among the early Christians, Origen had held the same view; while St. Augustine had said, "It is difficult, if not impossible, for us to conceive what sort of days these were." The matter, then, stood thus: On the one side, the best Bible critics made to geology this overture; on the other, the most eminent geologists

* Among those that held this view, on purely critical grounds, were Augustine, Theodoret, Justin Martyr, Basil, and Origen.

said, this interpretation corresponds, at least approximately, to the chapters of physical history written in the rocks.

We may state another point raised in these heated discussions, although it is a little aside from the direct line of our argument. We refer to the controversy touching the Deluge; a controversy among believers rather than between them and men of science. It could not be expected that in an age of physical inquiry, so thrilling an act in the drama of history as the Flood would pass uninvestigated. In fact, it had often occupied the attention of learned men before the rise of geology, and the most absurd and fantastical notions concerning it had been put forth. Probably no question raised in the geological controversy has a more checkered history. The conclusion finally reached is, that geology is silent respecting it, suggesting no real difficulties, affording no substantial confirmations. But the thorough discussions of the subject have materially modified the opinions held by the best-informed scholars. These tell us the Noachian Deluge could not have been universal. The argument is twofold: (1) The language of the inspired historian does not, of necessity, make it universal. This, too, is an old opinion. Able commentators, such as Bishop Stillingfleet and Matthew Poole, who lived two centuries ago, held, on purely exegetical grounds, that the flood was but partial. (2) There was no need of a deluge covering the entire globe to accomplish the purpose. Besides, scientific investigation has made it quite clear that all the species of animals could not have been preserved in the ark without a succession of the most stupendous miracles; and to this there is no occasion for resorting.

What, then, is the status of the geological controversy? Truth will not permit us to say that it, like the astronomical, has passed wholly into history; still we are fast leaving it behind us. If we can not say that it is a burned-out volcano—if we still find some warmth in the old ashes and lava—nay, if there be even yet an occasional eruption from the crater, it is still true that no believer apprehends danger to the Christian vineyard. The Gospel stands on as firm a foundation as it did before the geologist had turned a single stone, or exhumed from the rocks a single fossil. Men listen to the story of the Cross as deferentially—sinners forsake their sins and come to God as readily—as in the days when the old interpretations of Genesis passed unchallenged. But is there any thing positive? This we

may safely affirm: The law of progressive development which pervades the Kingdom of Grace—*first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear*—is found to pervade also the Kingdom of Nature; the natural theologian finds in the stony book some of his choicest arguments and illustrations; some portions of the Scripture revelation find in the strata of the earth strong confirmation, thus verifying the promise, "Thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field." Having gained this standing point, it is difficult to repress a smile when we survey some of the perplexities of our fathers. When Sir Charles Lyell, a generation ago, undertook to demonstrate that the Niagara River had been thirty-five thousand years in scouring out its channel, a reverend anti-geologist denounced his calculation as a "stab at the Christian religion!" As though the antiquity of the gorge through which the waters of the great lakes find their way to the sea stood in a relation of antagonism to the work of the Christian ministry!

We have undertaken to divide the responsibility for the unhappy conflict of Religion and Science between the theologians and philosophers. We have also said that in the astronomical controversy the former were almost wholly in the wrong. But in the geological controversy it must be more equally divided. In this article attention is chiefly directed to the false position of Churchmen, for reasons so obvious that we need not state them. But we have all along had it in our mind to say that the record of the geologists, as a class, is far from creditable. While their science was still in an inchoate state, they were not content to await its matured conclusions; they must hasten to raise an issue with religion. Leaving out of account that considerable class of men who clearly saw that both religion and geology had a foundation—who firmly believed that in the end the two would harmonize—the case stands thus: On the one side was an illiberal and timorous class of believers, chiefly Church functionaries, who hastened to condemn a science of which they were almost wholly ignorant; on the other was a class of boastful and irreligious geologists, who hastened to do a much rasher thing, namely, to condemn an old and beneficent religion. The result was that both, falling upon a rock, were broken.

We have not taken the pains to put these facts in literary dress simply because they are in themselves interesting. They have their

moral. Perhaps we shall perform our readers a service if we draw that moral out into form. They show that the welfare of the race demands two kinds of intellectual activity, one religious, the other scientific—that these interpenetrate each other and are yet distinct—that the minister of reconciliation is to give himself specifically to the one, the natural philosopher to the other; they show that it is no one of the theologian's functions to decide, as a theologian, on scientific questions—that it is no one of the natural philosopher's functions to decide, as a natural philosopher, on religious doctrines; they show that the Church has put herself in a false position by going out of her sphere—that science has prejudiced the cause of truth by deciding on matters that are not amenable to natural law; they show that in two instances, when the human mind was ready to take a long stride in the advance, the ecclesiastics attempted to arrest it by their illiberal and ignorant opposition; they show that in both these instances religion and science have been harmonized, despite the fears of the believer, and the confident predictions of the infidel.

Surveying these two controversies from the point of view which we now occupy, we see how easily both of them could have been avoided. Had the theologians been men of moderation, had they been in sympathy with scientific inquiries, had they studied geology in the light of its own evidence, had they dispassionately reëxamined the Scriptures, they could scarcely have failed to discover two very useful canons of interpretation, which would infallibly have led them out of their difficulties: (1) That the Scriptures were not given to teach science, but salvation only; (2) That the language of Scripture is not scientific, but optical; that is, the inspired penman described phenomena as they appeared to be. This second canon deserves a word of comment. The very purposes for which a revelation is made left the inspired writers no alternative. Had the language of exact science been used, the Scriptures would not have been understood by those to whom they were addressed. Accordingly they speak the language of the time in which they were written, which, like all popular language, is the language of appearances. Even yet we speak the language of the Ptolemaic astronomy; we hazard the conjecture that there has never been an almanac compiled that described astronomical phenomena in heliocentric language. To the learned and unlearned alike the sun still rises and sets; and so it will continue

to do as long as it gives its light. Neither are we here placed at any disadvantage. "The leading religions of the East which still survive," says Hugh Miller, "such as Buddhism, Brahminism, and Parseeism, have all their astronomy, geography, meteorology, and geology, existing as component parts of their several systems." Unquestionably, the scientific weapon will prove most efficient in destroying these false religions. Sacred books can not long hold their place in an enlightened community if they are plainly opposed to scientific demonstration. We stand on a vantage-ground. The fate of Christianity is not contingent on the fate of any astronomical or geological theory. The Book of God speaks the language of the people, and so endures, whether the *Almagest* of Ptolemy or the *De Revolutionibus* of Copernicus is the received text-book in astronomy. Thus the fact urged by infidel philosophers against the Bible—that it does not speak the language of science—in the hands of the sound logician becomes an argument in its favor.

We have confined our attention wholly to two controversies, the astronomical and the geological; one of these is wholly historic, and the other will soon become such. We conclude, for the present, with some general reflections which we esteem important.

The center of the Christian System is not any scientific fact or doctrine, but the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Faith in him is the bond that unites us to God, and not a philosophical doctrine. The man who believes and obeys the MASTER we will receive as a brother, however widely he may differ from us in scientific or theological opinions. So long as the Church confines herself to her mission—which is to preach the common salvation—there will be peace within the walls of our Zion; but when she leaves that, to arbitrate in matters of Science and Theology, disastrous consequences follow. She must not shut out the believer from free investigation into every department of knowledge the God of Truth bids his children enter. Religious men need even yet to enlarge their views of the mission of Science. In the mean time we restate the principal condition of good-will between the ecclesiastic and the philosopher.

If an armistice is ever agreed to between these high contracting parties these will be the leading articles: Religion is a legitimate manifestation of the human soul—so is Science; the religious and the scientific are two modes of thought, ever blending, ever shading

into each other, the two poles of the human mind; the theologian may carry on his inquiries independently, so may the philosopher; the theologian may not call the astronomer away from his telescope, or the geologist from his chisel and hammer, to listen to the first chapters of Genesis—the scientist may not interrupt the believer's prayer with his talk about "a settled order of nature." Adopting the figure of the quaint old divine who compared Reason and Faith to the two sons of the patriarch, there can be no quiet in the family of promise so long as either son seeks to supplant his brother.

In the case of new scientific discoveries, let the theologian and the philosopher, for the time being, work on independently; let not the former be in undue haste to measure the latter's theories by his texts, nor the latter to measure the former's texts by his theories.

The theologian need not abandon science, although its later discoveries seem antagonistic to his cherished opinions; the scientist need not abandon religion, although his last-gleaned facts seem hostile to its truths. There is no absurdity in one's holding, at least for the time, two lines of thought which seem to lead to the most widely opposed conclusions. Of course, comparison and coördination must finally come. Then there will be agreement—at least not antagonism; for truth is one. Thus, after coming up through many contradictions and antagonisms, the unity of truth will appear to those who have the constancy to endure—sad fact that most seem resolved, like the pilgrim Israelites, to fall out by the way. Assuredly we Christians can afford to examine, and to wait in patience, to possess our souls. What have we to do with an error or a lie but to throw it on the immense heap of rubbish that the past has accumulated?

Thus, an armistice between Reason and Faith may be proclaimed, and an armistice that will lead to permanent peace. Then both of the parties to this old quarrel will see their mistakes. Then it may be seen that a man may be both an inquirer and a believer; that he may have both a Science and a Religion. Such a day as this will yet come. The Past believed, but its faith was the faith of ignorance; the Present doubts, but its skepticism is the skepticism of partial knowledge; the Future will believe, and its faith will be the faith of a perfect science. We await the intellectual millennium, when Reason and Faith, the lion and the lamb, shall lie down together, and the frailest child of God shall lead them.

V.—INDIFFERENCE TO THINGS INDIFFERENT.

"Some have attached too much importance to matters not essential, and have contended too earnestly about them."—WHATELEY'S "*Rise, Progress, and Corruptions of Christianity.*"

See Recent Discussion on "EXPEDIENCY AND PROGRESS," in the "*Millennial Harbinger*" and "*American Christian Review.*"

THE caption chosen for this article does not represent all that is to follow, since things of minor importance, as well as things indifferent, shall receive attention as we pass along. The intention is mainly to show our tendency to eliminate that which is of little or no consequence, instead of reaching the central thought in a given system of things. A full examination of this subject should not fail to destroy all confidence in *rationalism*—in man's ability to reason out all religious truth from the data this world affords. His constant election of the merely accidental and adventitious, instead of substantive reality, the transient instead of the permanent, and the form instead of "the power of godliness," ought to create a salutary distrust of his unaided ability to manage his spiritual interests for either this world or the next.

To grasp the substantive, the non-transient, and essential—to elect these from among those things that accidentally adhere to them—requires Divine wisdom, coming down from above. No illustration of man's failure to do this more palpable or more shameful need be sought for than is found in the various human bases laid down by religious bodies for Christian union. Take, for example, the essential and indispensable truth that there is one God—"the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, our Savior"—whose being and attributes, as revealed in the Scriptures, ought to suffice us, without any speculation about his form or essence. But infallible man feels so little satisfied with the few barren, indefinite ideas revealed about God, that he must decide "Him to be without body, parts, or passions," and insist upon this as essential to belief in God at all, and rejects all who do not subscribe to his special dogma. This gave rise to another theory, that the Divine Being has a form in all respects like unto man; and hence a sect arose in the Church

called "Anthropomorphists." Now, if salvation depended upon either of these theories, both of which are false, and not upon the essential truth affirmed in the Bible, there might be some apology for the controversy it sprung upon the world; but, as it is, its only use seems to be to show man's tendency to mingle the indifferent and the essential without discrimination, for he might be a true believer in God with or without either of these speculations.

In the same category of things we would place all those questions as to the relative "mode of existence" of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, since we have no likeness of the Trinity on earth, that we know of. True, man's body, soul, and spirit is a *trinity*, for they are "three in one;" and again, in the body alone, we find a *quadrinity*, four in one—the osseous system, the muscular system, the circulatory system, and the nervous system; but whether our little trinity or quadrinity expresses the mode of the Divine existence, we could not say, nor is it necessary to know: although these illustrations prove that there is no contradiction or absurdity involved in the idea of "three in one, and one in three." The thing essential is to believe in the "Godhead," in the language found in the Bible; the thing indifferent is all speculation, about the *manner* of that existence; and yet we may be safe in saying the religious world has been more convulsed over the latter than over the former.

In no single instance, perhaps, have men exhibited their incapacity for eliminating the real *differentia* more than in the conditions required for Christian union and fellowship. The exhortation to be all "of one mind," to be of the "same judgment," and that "there be no divisions among you," has been carried to an injurious degree of exactness, that demands unanimity in things by no means necessary to be united in. A narrow view of the whole scope of the Christian religion fails to see the generous margin allowed for differences among Christians, in a thousand particulars, before their fraternal relations should be the least endangered. All who have believed on the Lord Jesus, and from the heart have confessed and obeyed Him, *are one in Him*, but may not be one *in any thing else.* Christians may not only differ in national peculiarities, in language, in color, in race, in mental culture, in degree of civilization, but may differ in their views of government, in politics, in plans and ways of doing good, and may even differ as regards some religious tenets,

without affecting their Christian fellowship. "In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female." Neither the Jew-part nor the Greek-part of the man comes into Christ, but there is something inside of all that is Jewish, and inside of all that is Barbarian, that attaches to Jesus, and that may be considered apart from all the accidents that made him "Scythian, bond or free;" and this something is the substantive and eternal spirit which, in spite of the accidental accretions gathered on its way through the world, believes and obeys the Redeemer, and, by the grace of God, is so inundated with his light and love that it is not only in Christ Jesus, but becomes a part of his spiritual body.

A Rocky Mountain Indian, found by the Missionary of the Cross, has become a humble, loving disciple of Jesus, at the same time that an elegant gentleman of civilization also from the heart obeys the Gospel of Christ. Bring them together, and when Paul looks upon the two he will say, "In Christ Jesus neither culture nor the want of it availeth any thing, but *a new creature*." The one lays off his blanket, and the other his comely attire—these things are indifferent in the kingdom. The one lays aside his education, as not necessarily any part of Christianity; the other is likewise willing to surrender his ignorance. Then the souls of each dislodge their heavy bodies, as transient and temporal things. Then they may lay aside their respective prejudices, mistakes in action, and misconceptions of Divine truth, and find their spirits standing before God, containing the only thing that "avails in Christ Jesus"—that faith, humility, and love that shows them to be "new creatures." The one was far greater in the world than the other, owing to circumstances not generated by himself, but before God the humbler of the two will be the greater.

The point to be reached by these remarks is, to feel that Christian union does not require oneness in every thing, nor oneness in any thing, except *oneness in Christ*. If the poor Indian has understood but the rough outlines of the Christian system, and is still ignorant of a thousand things not yet learned, and is in error about a thousand others he thinks he does understand—still, if "God has received him," (Rom. xiv, 3,) it settles the question of fellowship with Him, and shows how wide a margin the Almighty may leave for a humble soul that is sincerely seeking the way to heaven.

The utmost care will nevertheless be necessary to prevent latitudinarianism from insinuating itself into our theology, while compassionating the ignorance and honest prejudices of those who need our sympathy; for although Paul says, (1 Cor. 7, 19,) "Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing," he also says, in the same verse, that "*Keeping the commandments of God*" is something. If the Jew could not be won from circumcision at once, Paul was willing to wait till he could *grow him* out of that, provided he was willing to receive Christ and do his commandments, which, although mixed up with the dead rubbish of a really abrogated law, would, after awhile, prevail, and fully "enlighten the eyes of his understanding." Accordingly the preaching on the day of Pentecost did not engage itself with battling against the ceremonial law, but rather simply to insert the Gospel leaven, and give it time to work. The main thing to be gained was access for Christ to their hearts. They feared not error if only truth can be heard, nor darkness if only the "light of the glorious Gospel of Christ might shine into their hearts." There was no indifference as to "the commandments of God"—the indifference was about things really or comparatively indifferent—such as circumcision, Sabbaths, new moons, meats and drinks, and even sacrifices, at the hands of those who really believed in Christ.

It may be difficult to admit that early Jewish Christians continued to offer sacrifices after believing on Christ, the great sacrifice for sin; but the epistles to the Hebrews, to the Galatians, and other Scriptures, show indisputably that Paul labored much to dispossess them of such practice. Besides, in Acts, 21st chapter, we have an account of certain brethren having an offering made "for every one of them." "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of the Jews there are who believe, *and they are all zealous of the law.*" This, of course, implies that the central rite of the law—sacrifice—was not as yet abandoned, for, had they abandoned the law of sacrifice, they could not have been very zealous about any other part of the law. Without farther attempt to prove that they did practice this rite, we may pause and contemplate the tardiness of the human mind to shuffle off its religious errors, and admire the long-suffering of our God in waiting on our "slowness of heart." The seed grows and God waits. As the husbandman waiteth for the early and the latter rain, so the Lord does no violence in forcing the growth of the soul to an

unnatural speed, but has long patience, until faith in Jesus shall have time to displace circumcision, animal sacrifice, new moons, and Sabbath days.

There is a certain degree of spiritual development which only renders a man unhappy, morose, and unkind. It is that degree that has merely learned to *hate sin*, but that has not yet attained to the *love of humanity*. Such a Christian is always censorious, impatient of imperfection in others, and inclined to be very exacting about the ceremonial of religion. He understands the law better than the Gospel, he will have sacrifice rather than mercy, makes little allowance for circumstances, and has the narrow gate narrower than it really is. There may be a true work of grace begun in his heart, but then it is only begun. He lacks that malleable state of Christian sympathy that can become all things to all men, for the sake of winning them to Christ. Instead of leaving his theological moorings for awhile to associate himself with one who is out of the way, and, by gentle tractions, to lead him heavenward, he stands at a safe distance and yells his upbraidings and censures at him, scolding him back to God. Small departures from the truth in another he magnifies into mortal sins, and the narrowest dehiscences are widened into impassable gulfs, while the constant contemplation of peccadillos contracts his mind till there is no room for a large view of humanity, involved as it is in so many difficulties in the way of a perfect knowledge of God.

Not so with Paul. His sympathy for humanity, his love of souls, his knowledge of their weakness, his broad philosophy of spiritual growth, and, above all, the influence of the Holy Spirit—all lead him to make much allowance for men, to wait on their development, and to accommodate himself to their prejudice and ignorance, that he might win them to Christ. When he beheld a soul far from God, he ran to his side, linked his sympathies with his, identified himself with him, *became whatever he was*, and having securely bound that soul to his own, he tried to work his way back to Christ with him. What was the eating of a little meat, or the not eating of it, to him, if he could save a soul thereby? Did he refuse to circumcise a man if that would give him access for Christ to their hearts? Did he stubbornly "stand up for the whole truth" when he saw that many feeble souls could not bear it all? When he saw that his despising a "holy

day" would offend a weak brother, did he stiffly maintain his orthodoxy under pretense of "contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints?" And even if a *quasi* respect to the defunct ceremony of *sacrifice* was necessary to save what little faith they had in Christ, did he, on the plea of being "*sound*," refuse to become a Jew, for the time being, that he might save a Jew? Did he consider it a "retreating to the sects"—Pharisees and Sadducees—when he became all things to all men? The difference between Paul's generous views of these things, and those of small Pharisees of all ages, is just the difference between the divine and the human. With him every thing transient, accidental, and merely ceremonial, was lost in the superlative importance of faith in Jesus, even if that faith should have to keep company awhile with a defunct ceremonial. He knew that the old leaves that fall not off in Autumn, will surely fall at the swelling buds of opening Spring. No rational man ever wishes the darkness of night to break into sudden day without the help of twilight. God has put a green hull around every nut of the forest to protect its tenderness, and to convey its nourishment until the seed is fully matured. This hull gradually dries, withers, and falls off, when the seed no longer needs its aid; but it would be cruel to tear it from its place too soon, and leave the kernel to exposure and to death. Even so the Jewish religion for centuries contained the Christian religion, and could not be torn from around it so soon, nor would the latter have thrived very well under such treatment.

How carefully ministers should deal with the souls of men may be seen from the fact patent to all—*that truth is often, for a time, supported even by error.* Had the Jew been required to renounce Moses and the law at once, on the reception of the Gospel, few, if any, would ever have become the disciples of Christ. Even during his personal ministry, they more than once left off following him on account of his hard sayings—that is, on account of his *true* sayings. But, being allowed to entertain much of their former religion, they received Christ, the Messiah, as a farther development of their own covenant. They received Christ, then, because they were allowed, for a time, to entertain some errors which they were not prepared to give up. How magnificent that spiritual understanding of the Apostle to the Gentiles, who, standing upon God's observatory and seeing things as the Spirit sees them, defines the value of meats and drinks,

new moons, sabbath days, sacrifices, and circumcision; and, taking up the last as a test-case for all the rest, declares that "circumcision is *nothing*, and uncircumcision is *nothing*"—that "neither if we eat, are we the better; nor if we eat not, are we the worse"—that "one man esteemeth one day above another, another man esteemeth every day alike," and so *indifferent is Paul to things indifferent* that he allows each one to have it his own way, and be "fully persuaded in his own mind." Meanwhile he comprehends the several capacities of his infantile brethren, and gives milk or strong meat as the case will allow. He will give faith in the sacrifice of Christ time to absorb all the faith they now have in other sacrifices, will give the circumcision of the heart time to dismiss circumcision in the flesh, and keeps urging that "the kingdom of God is not meats and drinks, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit."

An altitude gained like this is so unlike the dwarfish attainments of his own, or even of modern times, that one is in danger of being considered latitudinarian, unsafe, and "unsound," who even surveys the ground on which Paul trod. However, in the ratio in which we can walk with him on these highlands of God, we ought to be able to exercise the same forbearance toward those who fear all this liberty of the Gospel. It can not be denied that the distance between him who said "circumcision is nothing," and him who said "except ye be circumcised and keep the law of Moses ye can not be saved," is very great. Nor can it be denied that the distance is about the same between him who could bear with such ignorance and error in the ancient Church, and him who breaks fellowship with a modern Church that has a small melodeon in their Sunday school. Granting, as the writer does, that there are cogent and well-founded objections to instrumental music in public worship, this departure from the simplicity of the Gospel is nevertheless animalcular compared to those tolerated by the apostles in the early Church—tolerated, not that they approved them—but as the Greek general replied, when asked why he was retreating so fast, "I am pursuing an advantage that lies behind," so, those wise men often found advantages lying in concession to the weakness and ignorance of their brethren.

The "changeable and the changeless," the "flexible and the inflexible" in religion, are expressions exceedingly unsavory to one who does not restrain his denunciations of their authors long enough to

understand what is meant by them. And yet it would be admitted that while the command "give to him that asketh thee" is as changeless as the word of God, the *manner* of obeying the injunction may nowadays differ widely from that which was common in those days, and to which Jesus especially referred. We can now obey this order without ever giving a cent to a street beggar, since our improved methods of taking care of the poor prevent the necessity of it. The taxes and poor-houses far surpass any method ever known in primitive times, and are so complete that city authorities forbid our giving to mendicants. Evidently we are at liberty to feed the poor in a manner different from what the Savior alluded to, and this is what is meant by the "changeable" and the "flexible;" and thus must we adapt ourselves to "the varying conditions of society" in obeying the commandments of God.

Now, while it is the duty of the censorious and fault-finding to imbibe more of the love of God and less bitterness against those who either are, or are thought to be, in error, and so preserve Christian regards, in spite of adventitious differences, it is also the duty of those who are wrongfully represented and misunderstood, to have compassion on those who do them wrong. No one is ever *intentionally* misrepresented by *good* men. Besides, men's intellectual habits, often unconsciously to themselves, lead them into censoriousness and unfair methods of debate. Public debates are sure to spoil the spirits of second or third-rate abilities. A great man, like Alexander Campbell, can debate through many years without contracting those vicious habits of reasoning that so often overtake those of inferior capacity. The vicious and unmanly habits referred to are such as making false issues, where, in a true issue, triumph would not be so apparent; refusing to accept an explanation in the sense in which it was intended; taking no pains to honestly understand an opponent's true position; merely asserting, instead of arguing, where it is believed the populace are known to accept the former more greedily than the latter—these, and all the *ad captanda* intended to slap in the face an argument that can not be fairly met, are weaknesses inherited from many disputings in public, and deserve commiseration on the part of those who have not been subjected to their influence. These are scars left upon the minds of those who have encountered the enemies of truth, and who have not

been able to parry every stroke of the foe, nor to defeat him, without using his own mode of warfare, to some extent. Now, a proper love for humanity will not denounce these on account of their infirmities, although they may be very repulsive. For example—the narrowest-minded men are always the most confident of their own opinions, they are the most denunciatory, and always claim to be the standards of orthodoxy. The more you focalize the rays of heat, the more intense that heat becomes in its contracted circumference; the more general a man's knowledge and sympathies, the more he is disposed, like the sun, to flood the world with his love and gentleness. The strongest focalizers are, of necessity, the most ignorant of men, and such should not always be condemned so much, as it is often their misfortune, rather than their crime. Hence the patience Paul manifested toward his Jewish brethren, who could not lift their eyes from the law, arose from his comprehensive view of the Christian religion, and of the gradual development of spiritual life in the soul; and when we say he was *indifferent to things indifferent*, we do not mean that the errors tolerated were as good for men as the truth, but that none of the above-named were considered of sufficient consequence to warrant unkind upbraidings, or even ill-feelings. Why, then, do modern preachers treat so harshly any one who may not, in practice, but merely in theory, get out of the way a little? One believes in abstract operations of the Holy Spirit; another, that repentance precedes faith; another, that instrumental music belongs to the chapter of expediencies, (or such like;) another, that the title of "Reverend" is innocent enough, and, lo! the dirty feet of Harpies are upon them, as if they were outlaws against the Kingdom of God. Wherefore? Because the religious pulse is low in these theological constables, whose piety has all left the heart, producing a congestion of head religion, consisting in "clear views," critical acumen, sound theory, intolerance of mistakes, however small or however honest, and in denouncing better men than themselves. The gnats are not yet all strained out, nor the camels all swallowed; nor are the "mint and anise and cumin" all gone; the constant selection of things comparatively indifferent, instead of "judgment, mercy, and truth," is still the habit of poor little man.

Why the world always places the intellect above the affections, the head above the heart, might be a question for the philosopher. In

our schools the premiums are given not to the *best*, but to the *smartest* boy. His mind, quick as a steel-trap, triumphs over the other's conscience, sensitive as an angel's. The blunted conscience of the covetous man remains in the Church, the whisky manufacturer and vender take high seats in the synagogue, and half-converted, prayerless souls of the most indifferent grace—if they only hold the doctrines "we teach"—can sit down at the communion table, while hearts the most subdued and mellow with the love of God, and that would die for Jesus' sake, are thought to be unworthy, because of some honest head-mistake as to some theory of religion. In the day when God shall bring up the valleys and press down the hills; when he shall make the "last first and the first last," and "turn the world upside down," the heart will be found above the head, love above knowledge, and a godly life above a sound theory.

Too much attention to the "form of godliness" draws religion all from the inside to the outside, from the heart to the surface. The pushing of the lips toward God, while the errant heart is on an excursion somewhere else, is characteristic of those who object to the healing of a sick man on the Sabbath day. The Catholic and High Churchman give baptism the privilege of bringing the sinner to God without either faith or repentance, and all pedobaptists bring children into the Church by force of this rite alone. This is an election of the form without the substance, the husk without the ear, the shell without the seed. It is the antipode of transcendentalism that rejects all forms in religion, and seeks for direct communion with God, without the intervention of a Savior, an ordinance, or a Church. The one has a body and no soul, the other seeks to have a soul without a body. But as long as God shall have soul and body grow together, as complements of each other, so long will he give contradiction to both formalism and transcendentalism. As the substance of food is always obtained from the various forms of food, so is spiritual good found in the forms of religion, while forms alone, without the power of godliness, are like husks for the soul.

Richard Whateley has well said, "Some have attached too much importance to matters not essential, and have contended too earnestly for them." To "eat with unwashed hands" was a greater offense against Pharisaism than to neglect one's father or mother. Nor did these follies die with the Jewish dispensation. Even now there are

not a few who busy themselves in deciding that *unleavened* bread is most acceptable in the Lord's Supper, since that was what the Savior used; also that because "he took the *cup*," we should, therefore, use but one; and some even assume, that as the Supper was instituted in the "evening," that time should still be observed by us—and in an upper room—thus eliminating the merely accidental to the discredit of the real intention of the ordinance. Our inveterate tendency to grasp at the mere husk of religion is farther manifested in the disposition to make the Lord's Supper the *recognition of orthodoxy*, as if "communion" with any one indorses all his theological views. You will pray with a member of another Church, sing with him, preach with him, without indorsing him or compromising your party position; but the moment you eat a morsel of bread from the same platter, in remembrance of Jesus, you feel responsible for his errors. Thus, this divine and soul-reviving rite is diverted from its original purpose, and turned into a denominational hedge, to fence in our orthodoxy.

The Donatists of the fourth century inaugurated a war that rent the Church for two centuries, on a question of the "regularity" of the ordination of a certain bishop, growing more and more pious as the battle waxed hotter, paying no attention to the havoc made of all the real interests of the cause. Whether a Papist gets drunk just after receiving the "sacrament" or not, he must *not* deny the doctrine of "*real presence*." He may be guilty of petit larceny, but must never doubt the dogma of the "immaculate conception." Many a long day was spent in dispute whether clergymen should wear white or black gowns—at last, *black* was incontrovertibly proved to be more orthodox than white, the robe of righteousness, meanwhile, attracting very little attention. The Rev. Mr. Tyng has been cashiered for preaching the Gospel in a Methodist meeting-house, without regarding certain *red tape ceremonies* which God never commanded him to observe. Another of his brethren, a few years before, was arrested by the Church constables, in Canada, for officiating without the authorized clerical attire. O! mint, mint, mint! thy markets are always crowded, while judgment, mercy, and truth still go a-begging—peddled from door to door. Men are dying without God, while the called and sent "successors of the Apostles" are fixing their phylacteries and enlarging the borders of their garments.

What are the agonies of the victim on the rack, compared to the fame of him who would paint a dying groan; and what is the salvation of men compared to ecclesiastical forms, priestly etiquette, surplices, black and white robes! Preached in a Methodist meeting-house! Judgment be upon him. Damn him well. He ought to have known better.

The "mint, anise, and cumin" of the New Testament do not fairly represent these priestly stupidities, but represented the less important matters of the law of God, and "ought to be done" when justice, mercy, and the love of God are not thereby compromised; but this elimination of the commandments of men, this *odium theologicum* stands in the way of both the greater and the less commandments of God. Formalists, Pharisees, and hypocrites never "go and learn what this meaneth—*I will have mercy, and not sacrifice*," inasmuch as they always prefer the sacrifice, or some other formality, to the subjective part of religion. With them, the disciples had better starved a fortnight than to "pluck the ears of corn on the Sabbath day;" would rather let the sick go down to their grave than be healed on the Sabbath day, or to carry his bed. But the Savior taught them he would prefer a kind and merciful heart in them to all their sacrifices; that these are, although right, the mere "cumin" of the law. "He shall have judgment without mercy that hath showed no mercy," no matter how many sacrifices he may have offered. "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your Heavenly Father will forgive you," for *this*, rather than for your obedience in the most costly outside ordinances.

The great Legislator for men has even made a difference between the intrinsic value of his own laws—some he calls "the greatest commandments," and some "the least commandments." Rather than not have the regular temple service go on, on the Sabbath day, he would allow the priests to "profane the temple" by doing its servile work on that day. Rather than not have David and his men fed when "a hungered," he permitted them to eat the show-bread; and when the disciples plucked the ears of corn, he allowed mercy to take the precedency of mere legality, showing that, as the "Sabbath was made for man," whenever the Lord of the Sabbath saw it was in the way of man's interests, on some emergency, it had to yield to the higher law of mercy. Now, if God's own commandments some-

times were made to stand aside, that he might bring some greater good to his creatures, how ineffably presumptuous for men to post their traditions on the way to heaven, and say—"Except ye do these ye can not be saved!" As in all ages, "fools still rush in where angels fear to tread," and exalt the accidental to the position of the truly essential. Nevertheless, after all that has been here said, the meed of honesty and sincerity must be awarded to most men in the midst of all these mistakes. Our minds take in but a small part of Divine truth at a time; we can look directly at only a few degrees of the great periphery of things, and sometimes very unimportant things enter in and take up all the room. Still, we should not fail to learn the several lessons easily deducible from the foregoing considerations.

1. That other people have as good a right to be imperfect, and to entertain mistaken views, as we ourselves, and that, perhaps, they no more frequently exercise that right than we do. We must remember that they are still in the flesh, and that their three or four pounds of brain is all they have to work with. And being encompassed about with so much infirmity, they, of course, cherish many mistakes, until educated and developed from childhood to manhood. Nor are these intellectual prejudices fatal to their salvation, where God sees a true heart that would do just right, were that right but fully known. The question with God is, not so much "how far have you got along," as "which way are you going?" If he sees that faith in Christ, although associated for awhile with faith in other sacrifices, is winning the soul heavenward, he waits for the precious fruit to ripen. A little of Christ's leaven will leaven the whole lump, and it is only those who have not quite enough religion to love humanity, that become impatient and intolerant of faults no greater than their own.

2. We must learn to eliminate from all the errors of good men the single fact, that Christians *are growing*. They may be standing on the very first round of Jacob's Ladder, amid much of the fog and miasma of the earth, seeing nothing very clearly; but if the eye is fixed upon the Star of Bethlehem, and the soul cries out, "Nearer, my God, to thee"—then "take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones." Many a gem is covered up with mud and rubbish, but it is a gem for all that. When the "Mountain of Light"—the center jewel now in Queen Victoria's crown—was first picked up in one of the gulches in Golconda, by a peasant, it seemed, to the common eye,

so rough and ungainly that he sold it to a jeweler for a very small sum. And even after its value was appreciated, it required three years' grinding, by the lapidary, to shape it, and bring its true effulgence out. And may not a true love for the Savior be found in company with intellectual mistakes about new moons, sacrifices, Sabbath days, and even about some doctrines of the New Testament? If any one deny this, does he not thereby demonstrate his own ignorance of the more advanced lessons of Christianity?—a mere beginner in Bible study? These primer scholars always think they have gone through the encyclopedia. The Pharisees could make no apology for the disciples plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath day, while Jesus could compassionate that sinful woman, and look for some spiritual development even in her heart. We establish schools in every State for the development of idiots, kindly named "feeble-minded children," and, after years of toil, the faintest intimations of intellectual action, evoked from a fearful depth of inanity, are hailed with delight as proofs of capacity and pledges of mental growth. And when certain persons manifest a moral incapacity parallel to this, we must not "break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax." Whatever you do, take heed that ye despise not "*the little ones*," for a Father's love will protect them if it put a millstone around your neck; for in the great day when Christ shall make "the first last and the last first," it may appear that the most ignorant and mistaken disciple will reveal a greater struggle made against infirmity, and a greater agony to enter the Kingdom of God, than those who judged and condemned them in the days of their flesh.

VI.—THE SECRET OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SUCCESS.

THE fact of this success will not be denied. The number of Roman Catholics in the United States is unquestionably increasing, and increasing steadily and rapidly. A part, doubtless the larger part, of this increase, is without significance; but the whole of it is skillfully employed by a people who understand well the use that may be made of such a circumstance, in proof of the strength of Catholic arguments, and the adaptation of Catholic doctrines to American minds and institutions. Thus, the fact of increase in the past is made tributary to success in the future. Nor is this argument to be despised. A system which commends itself to no one; which, after a fair trial, makes no converts, comes very soon to be despised and neglected. On the other hand, there are multitudes of men, who, without troubling themselves to look at the proof of abstract doctrines, and without being capable, in many cases, of doing so, conclude that claims which have been recognized by large numbers of intelligent and earnest men, must be strongly supported.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Romanists take special pains to keep their growth in numbers, wealth, and influence prominently before the public. They have even increased the amount of their stock in trade by borrowing freely, not to say recklessly, from the future. By the year 1900—so we are confidently assured—Catholicism in the United States will outnumber all Protestant sects combined. This may or may not be true. Ecclesiastical arithmetic is not always reliable. It has largely overestimated past successes; and when fancy is added to pride and policy, as elements in the problem, the result can hardly be classed as one of pure mathematics.

Figures may be at once accurate and delusive. The numbers which the Catholic Church in this country claims now, as compared with those claimed twenty years ago, may be correctly stated, and yet the statement produce a false impression. We shall, for example, mistake the meaning of these figures, if we fail to notice that the two main elements of increase, emigration and natural propagation, are utterly without significance. By the first, Catholicism has gained

here only what it lost abroad; and by the second, it has multiplied itself merely from within—a circumstance which can have no bearing on the problem of its influence upon those without. And after we shall have eliminated these two elements, it will be found that the conquests made by this Church, whether from the world or from Protestantism, are far less than would be likely to be supposed upon a superficial consideration of its statistics.

Still, it is certainly true that such conquests have been made. Here and there, all over the land, Protestants of a peculiar turn of mind have become Catholics. The cases are well known, because they have been carefully heralded. And even admitting that they are comparatively rare, they are not without significance, in showing the ability of Catholicism to assert its claims, with some measure of success, upon the free people of this age and country. This is still more signally manifested in what may be called the *social* advancement of the Church. It is growing in respectability. The morning paper makes it a polite bow. Candidates for Congress shake it warmly by the hand. State legislatures vote it tokens of dear love and esteem. Grave monthlies speak of it in terms of most *brotherly* affection. Many Protestant Churches give it a *quasi* recognition; and some are even proud to dress themselves in its old clothes!

The substance of a late paper in the *Atlantic Monthly*, on "Our Roman Catholic Brethren," is, that Catholicism is recovering its audacity; is beginning to strike back at its assailants; knows how to raise money; appreciates the power of perfect organization; is making converts from Protestantism; and that Father Hecker is a living representative of the genius and power of the Church in America.

But what is the secret of all this? Has the Church made converts from Protestantism by simple audacity in striking back at its assailants? by the sheer "power of perfect organization?" by understanding and using the arts and trickeries for raising money? Far from it. All these are but auxiliaries. Organization, however perfect, and however potential as an aid, can do nothing by itself. Such an agency, though supported by millions of money, and urged on by unspeakable audacity, could never convert one single intelligent and serious American to Fetichism, or any other form of open and undisguised Paganism. Organization can effectively present and press the

claims that are sought to be advanced; but the real strength of the effort, the true motive power of the machinery, will be found to lie, after all, in the claims themselves. Unless these either be, or seem to be, good; unless they appear to meet the wants of the human heart, and to satisfy the demands of the human intellect, they will be rejected, whatever the skill with which they may be advocated, or the power with which they may be pressed.

The true source of Catholic influence, the true secret of this Church's success, is to be sought, therefore, in *the character of its claims*. Blazing tapers, gorgeous robes, artistic music, costly architecture, may captivate the frivolous and unthinking, but intelligence and earnestness look beyond and behind all these, to the vital elements and distinguishing doctrines of the institution. If it be conceded, as we think in all charity it must be, that intelligent and earnest men *have* been converted to Romanism, the question will arise, What was it that converted them? What essential good was *offered* and *promised* by the Church, which captivated their heart and their intellect? The promise thus made may have been delusive; the Church may not have possessed the good which it offered; but still it *claimed* to possess it; and insisted that it could be found no where else; and it could only have been with the hope and expectation of finding it that any sincere man ever voluntarily entered the fold of that Church. If, now, we can ascertain what these *good things* are which the Catholic Church insists that she alone possesses, and to secure which, therefore, men enter her communion, we shall understand the real secret of her success, and be able, at the same time, to appreciate the wants and weaknesses of Protestantism.

Disregarding matters of minor importance, it is evident that the essential claims of Catholicism, those by which it would commend itself to us, and upon which it chiefly rests its case as against its great antagonist, are precisely those which *ought* to characterize the Church of Christ, but which do *not* characterize Protestantism. Hence, thoughtful and earnest men are becoming more and more dissatisfied with the latter, and it is not to be wondered at if, in some cases, they have mistaken the *image* of truth in the former for the truth itself.

Now, the Church of Rome claims to be, 1. Apostolic; 2. Catholic; 3. One; and, 4. Infallible.

These, we shall insist, are all elements or features of the true Church of Christ. Not one of them really characterizes the Church of Rome; but of all of them she exhibits a *simulacrum*—a *likeness* more or less perfect, which the unwary and unlearned in the Scriptures too often mistake for the original. We shall, in respect to each one of them, direct attention both to the picture and to the reality of which it is the image and resemblance.

1. Romanism declares, with every appearance of sincerity, that she is the holy *Apostolic* Church; the identical Church founded by the Apostles, which has come down from their days, with an unbroken chain of succession, and uncorrupted transmission of doctrine. By so saying she invites us to a comparison. She says, in effect, "Here is the Roman Catholic Church, a living institution, whose character and doctrines may be known and read of all men; and there is the original Apostolic Church, whose faith and doctrine may be equally well and easily known; they are one and the same Church—compare them and see."

There is a manly confidence in the claim as thus presented, which commends it to favor. The question of the "succession" is put in a tangible shape. It is not necessary, when the point is stated in this way, to travel over the whole intervening space between Simon Peter and Pius IX—between the Church planted at Jerusalem and the Church existing in Rome. All this dark, difficult, and dangerous journey is avoided; and the claim is demonstrated to be either true or false, by a much shorter and more satisfactory process. We are required only to place the two Churches side by side; if they are essentially the same, the succession of the one from the other will be readily admitted, and the *apostolicity* of the latter be as manifest as that of the former. If, however, they are not the same, but in their essential natures different, then the mere historical *succession* of the latter can not, and does not, prove its *apostolicity*.

We are convinced that the value of an outward "succession" has been greatly overestimated. There is no Church, Greek, Roman, or Protestant, which is not able to trace itself back, through a regular chain of history, to the days of the Apostles. Historically considered, they all have, and can all prove, the succession. Every Church came out of some other Church; every division was the division of a Church previously existing. Hence the thread of history belong-

ing to any sect in any part of the world, so far as it pertains to the human beings connected with it—that which we recognize as the living body, sect, or Church—reaches back to the Primitive Church.

But the Catholic tells us this does not meet the requirements of the case. He admits that the Arians of the third century succeeded personally and historically to the Apostles, as certainly as the Trinitarians. He knows that the Greek Church can establish the same kind of succession, and as indefeasibly, as the Roman. He will scarcely deny that the English and German Reformed Churches, which came out of the Catholic, had, at the time they came out, the very same succession that it had, and that since that time there has been no historical break in their chain. True, they have given birth to numerous sects, as the Catholic Church gave birth to them; but the offspring, in either case, has the same ancestry as its mother. Consequently, the bare fact that the Church of this generation succeeded to the place of the Church of the last, and that to the place of the one preceding, and so on, to the Church of the Apostles, is of no force in the argument. Being the same for all, it can be appropriated by none. Hence, we are necessarily directed to a different field of inquiry.

The Scriptures foretold that there would be a falling away from the *faith*, and a corruption of the *doctrine* of the Apostolic Church, notwithstanding the perpetuity of the historical and outward succession. Hence, the true Apostolic Church is that which retains the Apostolic faith and doctrine. Thus, we are furnished with the simple and perfect rule by which the claims of the Catholic Church are to be tested. If her faith and doctrine are precisely the same as those of the Church planted and instructed by the inspired Apostles, then she is what she declares herself to be, the holy Apostolic Church. But if she fail, when subjected to this test—if she lack the *true* succession of faith and doctrine—then her outward and personal succession is worth no more to her than to the hundred other heretical sects, large or small, which equally claim, and are equally entitled to claim, it. And it is precisely when subjected to this test that she does fail—totally, ruinously, hopelessly fail. And so conscious is she herself of this failure that she has been forced to reverse the very process of proof, and to rest her apostolicity upon her historical succession, than which there could be no sandier foundation.

We have too much respect for our readers to institute a comparison between the faith and doctrine of the Gospel and the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. Suffice it to say, they are identical in no single particular that distinguishes the Catholic Church. She does not even claim that they are identical; but instead of it, treats us to the monstrous pretension that the chain of *external* succession to which she holds *entitles* her to break and disregard that which is *internal.* She offers us, therefore, only the outward *image* of a genuine apostolicity, in which there is nothing true, living, or salutary.

2. We shall not dwell upon her claim to catholicity. Although it is one that she takes peculiar delight in parading, it is evident that if her apostolicity fails, her catholicity is only the catholicity of error. Still, there may be persons among our countrymen who are confounded, if not convinced, by the fact that the Romish Church is so wide-spread over the world. Certainly it is not "universal," as it claims to be, and if it were, it would be no guarantee of its truth. Heathenism may spread over the whole world, and still be heathenism. Falsehood may be supported by the majority, without losing its character. A grand apostasy may "deceive all nations," and still not be the Church of Christ!

But there is a true catholicity, a something adapted to, and designed for, "every creature" in "all the world." And it is, doubtless, with the hope of finding this precious something, this priceless bequest of the Lord, that men look to that Church which claims to possess it. But the slightest knowledge of the Scriptures would suffice to teach them that the Church of Christ is not the Church of England, of America, of Germany, or of Rome, taking its shape and color from the peculiarities of any nation or of any age but the Church of all the world. Not that it must necessarily and in fact be *distributed* over all the world, but that it must hold and teach, and be marked and distinguished by, the identical Gospel which the Head of the Church has *addressed* to all the world. The Church which *this* message collects out of the world, and which continues to live in obedience to *its* requirements, is the only true Catholic, as it is the only true Apostolic, Church. And whether there be but one such congregation, or millions; whether they be scattered everywhere, or confined to a single locality; whether they meet in Gothic

temples, or in caves and dens of the earth, they are still catholic, by Divine creation, and designated as such by a Divine principle.

We may continue, in courtesy, to speak of the Romish as the "Catholic" Church, just as we designate the *picture* of a man by the name of the man himself; but we shall do so with the distinct understanding that her catholicity, judged by the only true standard, is unreal and delusive.

3. The *oneness* of the Church is a capital item in the sum of her claims. The priests of Rome are gifted in portraying and caricaturing the sects and divisions of Protestantism, in contrast with "Catholic unity." It is assumed, and rightly, that the Church of Christ is one; that He founded *but* one; that he delivered to it one faith, and united all its members under one Head. This is true of the Church of Christ; this is also true, we are assured, of the Church of Rome, and is *not* true of Protestantism; consequently, the Church of Rome *is* the Church of Christ, and Protestantism is *not*.

This argument is lame in several particulars. In the first place, it assumes that the unity of Catholicism is the same as that which characterizes the Church of Christ. This is not true. The one is a unity secured by force and maintained by intolerance; the other, the voluntary agreement of men who were left perfectly free to differ. The one *binds* men together by chains of external authority; the other *brings* them together by the force of internal conviction.

Romanism may claim to be apostolic, and be simply amusing; may vaunt its catholicity, and excite only a smile; but when, after exterminating, or anathematizing, and banishing the hundreds of millions who dared to think for themselves, it exhibits the remaining millions of its bigoted and fettered devotees as the realization of *Christian* union, it is really audacious!

The claim is false and delusive, also, in the pretense that the unity of the Catholic Church is essentially different from that of any other sect. With the coolest effrontery she classes all Protestants together, as constituting a multitude of sects, and supposes that we will charitably take it for granted that she, forsooth, is not a sect. "Look outside of *the Church*," she says, "and what do you see? Methodist against Baptist, Episcopalian against Congregationalist, sect against sect, nothing but division and strife!" But might not the Greek Church say the same? or the Church or England? or,

indeed, any separate sect in existence? The Baptists are scattered over nearly all the world; and, find them where we may, in America, England, France, Germany, Australia, India, China, or elsewhere, they have, to say the least, as many and as reliable characteristics of unity as can be shown by the Catholic Church.

The Episcopal Church, taught by her mother, may say, with equal truth and equal audacity, "Look abroad, and what do you see? Catholic against Baptist, Methodist against Catholic, every-where sect warring against sect—only in *the Church* is there perfect unity!" The Catholic claim, therefore, is precisely identical with that of other sects and parties, and fails, as they all do, to furnish the basis, or exhibit the characteristics, of a genuine *Christian union.*

Such a union does not now exist. The Pope himself recognizes the fact by inviting *Protestant Christians* to embrace the occasion of the approaching ecumenical council to come *into* union with the Romish Church. That the Catholic Church is one within itself may be true; that the Episcopal, the Baptist, and other sects, are also respectively one to the extent of their several communions, is true in like manner; but that any one of them occupies the ground, or represents the unity, of the original and only Church of Christ, is not true.

This union, as we have said, does not now exist, having been destroyed by Roman and Protestant sects. But it is one of the objects of this QUARTERLY to turn the attention of men away from all sects and sectarian establishments, and to direct them to the Church of Jesus Christ as originally founded and established—the Church which recognized only His authority, and expressed its faith and doctrine only in the language of His Word—as the *beau-ideal* of a true, genuine, and Scriptural union. To this Protestantism *may* attain. It is moving toward it. It begins to see it. Its progress is stimulated and hastened by the necessities of the present, and the hopes of the future. But for Catholicism there is no hope. Her votaries will be chilled forever around her painted fires; and will be content with the deceitful image instead of the substantial reality.

4. In view of the doubts, uncertainties, and differences which obtain in religious society, it is not surprising that men are captivated by a Church which kindly proposes to resolve every doubt and remove every difficulty by the voice of *Infallibility.* Here is something which precisely meets the wants of our case. We can not afford to

live in doubt; we can not risk our eternal interests upon an uncertainty; it will not do to feel only that our road *may* be the right one. It leads to an eternal destiny; and if it is leading us astray, it will soon, O! how very soon, be too late to correct it. Above all things else, then, give us *infallible directions.*

This the Catholic Church proposes to do; declaring that her voice is unerring; her faith, her doctrine, her worship, infallibly correct. Now, if she can satisfy us that all this is true, we ask for nothing more. She essays to do so by assuring us, in the first place, that our private judgment is not to be relied upon; that we can not, without an infallible interpreter, understand the true sense of Holy Scripture. And, immediately afterward, she directs us to certain passages of Scripture in proof that *she* is this infallible interpreter. In other words, she asks us to rely upon the *correctness* of our private interpretation to prove that such interpretation is *not* correct! Our private judgment must first decide that the texts she quotes in proof of her infallible authority do prove it, before such authority can be recognized. Hence, according to her own showing, her infallibility rests upon a fallible foundation. If private judgment is reliable, we do not need an infallible authority distinct from it; and if it is not reliable, the existence of such authority can not be proved. But it must be either reliable or not; consequently, the Catholic claim to infallibility is either unsupported or unnecessary.

Again: By referring the decision of the case, as she must do, to the adjudication of private judgment, she recognizes, in the very act, that this is the highest court of appeal. Consequently, when its decision is against her claim, it is a final and conclusive decision. Now, whenever private judgment has been left free and unbiased, it has uniformly pronounced that the passages cited mean no such thing as she pretends; and hence, that her authority is wholly usurped, and her infallibility altogether without proof.

But what boots it? With characteristic genius, the feebler her claims the stronger her pretensions. She knows that human beings *desire* to cross the ocean of time in none but a vessel of unquestionable strength. She shows them a sound *deck:* can we wonder that she conceals the rottenness of the *keel?*

Are we then to be left without any genuine infallibility? Are anxious, trembling hearts never to hear the *Word,* save in mockery

of their hopes? Is there no *substance* to which this Romish *shadow* corresponds? no veritable living *voice* whose utterances are *divine?* Surely there is. The Church of Christ is solemnly bound, as she has been divinely enabled, to speak infallibly. And so long as she confines herself to her commission, her voice is really and truly the voice of God. The mistake and delusion of Catholicism lie in the assumption that whatever the Church may *please* to speak, rather than what she is *bound* to speak, is infallible. She is required to preach "*the Word*," to declare "*the whole counsel of God*," to limit her utterances to what He has *already spoken*, to give voice and expression to whatever has proceeded out of His mouth, without diminution, modification, or addition. And so long as she does this, her voice can but be His voice, and her teaching infallible.

Protestantism has grievously erred in this matter. While it has spoken many good words for the Bible, and contributed liberally for its publication, the weight of its example has been largely against its authority. Every sect has its doctrinal system, its distinguishing symbol, its controlling standard, its *something* besides the Bible for an authority. It does not, like the Catholics, claim that this something is infallible, and yet by resorting to it the infallibility of the Bible is practically set aside. Hence it has been the standing taunt of the Catholics that Protestants have *no* infallibility. If they answer that the *Bible* is their infallible rule, the crushing reply is ready: Why do you leave an infallible rule for one that is confessedly not such? There can be but one response, namely, that the creed, the symbol, the prayer-book, is the Church's *interpretation* of the Bible—thus yielding the whole question by abandoning the infallible Word for a fallible interpretation of it. The actual practical rule among these Protestant sects being their human creed or standard, and this laying no claim to infallibility, Protestantism evidently has none. It is not surprising, seeing the Church of Christ is legitimately expected to speak infallibly, and Protestantism, owing to the stupendous folly of her human creeds and symbols, not even claiming to do so, that men should direct their attention to that Church which does make the claim, however falsely and delusively it may be supported.

It is high time for Protestants to perceive the sophism that lurks in the word interpretation, and in all the arguments founded upon it; and to insist that the Word of God, in its plain and obvious sense,

being authoritative and infallible, is to be substituted by no human inventions or so-called interpretations; and that the Church which teaches that word faithfully, and teaches only that, is, to the full extent of such teaching, absolutely unerring. Thus will infallibility be referred to its only possible source, Infinite Wisdom. Thus the fatuous delusion of "authoritative interpretations" will be done away; and by substituting a genuine, in place of a simulated and pretended infallibility, the Catholic will be disarmed of his principal weapon of assault, while Protestantism will exchange the weakness of man for the strength of God.

Such are the essential elements of Roman Catholic success. She claims to possess things which are intrinsically good, while the divided and distracted state of Protestantism enables her to conceal the weakness of these claims, and even plausibly to justify them by contrast.

Fas est ab hoste doceri. Let Protestantism become *truly Apostolic* in faith and doctrine; let it earnestly embrace the principle, and mold itself upon the model, of a *genuine catholicity;* let it become *united,* not by forcing its members to *live* together in the *dark,* but by bringing them to *see* together in the *light*—making them of one mind and one judgment, that from the heart they may speak the same things; and above all, let the things spoken, whether pertaining to the elements of the faith, the ordinances of religion, or the growth in grace and in knowledge, be always and only the *Infallible Words* of God; and then it can not fail to be seen that by as much as Truth is superior to Falsehood, by so much is the Church of Christ superior to the Church of Rome. Thus, and only thus, in our judgment, will the tide of Roman Catholic successes in America be arrested and turned back.

VII.—THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS—HOW CAN IT BE ACCOMPLISHED?

NO question has ever agitated the public mind of more transcendent importance than Christian Union. The Savior prayed that his disciples might all be one, and his apostles constantly enjoined upon the Churches the necessity of the same thing. Hence, we ought to conclude, from these facts, even if we had no other evidence, that the subject is of the very greatest importance.

The history of the Church is a standing exhortation to all Christians to endeavor to keep the "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." Division has been the weakness of the Church from the beginning to the present time; and we can not hope for any signal and permanent triumph of the cause of Christ until these divisions are healed. Weak-minded and bigoted sectarians may undertake to justify, or at least apologize for, the present divided state of Christendom; and these may even contend that it is essential to a speedy triumph of the truth; but all candid, intelligent, and earnest Christians know well enough that these divisions are the weakness and shame of the Church, and that only in "union is there strength."

During our late civil war many of the clergy were among the most prominent to contend for the unity of our Government. They even went so far as to devote a large portion of their public ministrations in the pulpit to the discussion of the subject; and it can not be denied that their exhortations had very considerable influence in determining the course of the Northern people.

We do not propose now to discuss the wisdom of such a course on the part of the clergy. Among Christians there is some division of sentiment as to the propriety of using the pulpit for such a purpose. But, however this may be, there can be no two opinions as to the fact that these men now stultify themselves in refusing to coöperate in any great movement for the union of Christians. For, if it was a good thing to have a united country, and we think no one will question this, it is certainly of vastly more importance to have a united Church. One is simply a temporal arrangement, a thing only for

time; the other is a spiritual arrangement, and reaches, in its consequences, to the great eternity to come.

The present condition of religious society is a curious and interesting study. But that which pains us most is, that on every side we behold a multitude of palpable contradictions, while only here and there is seen that consistency which should characterize the children of God. The clergy, whose constant duty it is to proclaim a Gospel of peace, occupy most of their time in waging a warfare upon each other; while the people, who claim for themselves a common parentage and common hope, are never so religious as when fighting in the interest of parties. Hence, instead of the one Church for which the Savior died, and which alone is recognized in the New Testament, we have a thousand different and distinct societies, all claiming to be the Church of Christ. Certainly this is not a desirable state of things, and is not that for which Christ prayed, when he said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me."

For our present purpose, it will be sufficient to consider society, with respect to religion, as divided into three classes, namely, Catholics, Protestants, and Infidels. And it is of the greatest importance that the respective claims of these should be carefully and impartially considered. It is a very easy thing for Protestants, on the one hand, to denounce the Catholic Church as antichrist; and, on the other, any rebellion against the inconsistencies and incongruities of Protestantism, as infidelity; but it is vastly better, and certainly more in harmony with the spirit of Christ, to humbly and earnestly seek for the truth, whether found among Catholics, Protestants, or Infidels; for this alone can lead us in the path of life everlasting, and secure to us that "rest that remains for the people of God."

Catholicism has unity to recommend it, if it has nothing else; and it can not be denied that this is one of the chief elements of its strength. But this is the very point at which Protestantism is weakest, and until its divisions are healed, it can not hope for any great success in its efforts to break down the influence of Rome.

Another source of power in Catholicism is the professed infalli-

bility of its utterances.* The most *certain* road to success is *certainty*. All other things being equal, the Church that adopts an infallible creed will always be the strongest. In religion the human mind requires something upon which it can infallibly rest. Any doubt in reference to the creed is always an element of weakness. The Catholic Church, seizing the idea of infallibility, has steadily clung to it through all ages of its history, with a tenacity which clearly demonstrates its estimate of this dogma as an element of success. And if Protestantism would ever succeed, it must present to the world something more certain than its present limping, halting, hesitating, articles of faith. We must have something better than

> "You can and you can't, you shall and you sha' n't;
> You will and you won't;
> You 'll be damned if you do, and be damned if you do n't."

But while *human* creeds take the place of the *Divine* creed in the councils of Protestants, we can not hope for any thing like an earnest, vigorous faith, such as is necessary to overcome the world.

The chief weakness of Protestantism to-day is that it has nothing *settled* and *certain* to offer to the people upon which they can, without a doubt, rest their weary souls. True, Protestantism has pretended to oppose an infallible Church with an infallible Bible; but Protestantism has constantly stultified this plea, by requiring an almost indefinite number of conflicting human creeds, in addition to the Bible. And thus, while contending for the freedom of conscience and the right of individual interpretation, Protestants have assumed a position little less tyrannical, and equally as repulsive as that of Catholics. Hence, it will be seen, that in any controversy with Catholicism, Protestantism will labor at great disadvantage in the very particulars where it claims superior excellence. And, although we are free to admit that Protestantism, as a whole, is far better than Catholicism, as a whole, yet candor compels us to say that Catholicism is more consistent and far more powerful.

And now, if we consider the present aspects of Infidelity, the same candor will force us into some admissions, which, though cer-

*It is a little singular that three of the writers in this number of the QUARTERLY have noticed this fact. In one article it is fully elaborated, and its practical bearing on the great religious problem of the age shown to be of the greatest consequence. The concurrence of sentiment on this subject serves to intensify the importance claimed for it.—EDITOR.

tainly true, are generally overlooked by religious teachers. There is a great deal of what is called infidelity that is by no means the worst thing in the world. It is not so much a denial of the truth of the religion of Christ, as it is a denial of what is now called that religion. When the thinking mind fathoms the forms and ceremonies of the Catholic Church, it finds little to satisfy the thirsty soul, and certainly sees nothing in harmony with the exalted spiritualism which characterizes the teachings of the Christ. Weary of this cold, lifeless ritualism, the mind instinctively rebels at such a manifestation of religion; and rejecting this, and finding nothing but inconsistencies and contradictions any where else, it at last seeks peace in what is popularly called infidelity, but which more frequently is simply a seclusion of the soul from the barren wastes of formalism, or the conflicts and turmoils of human creeds. Very much of the Rationalism of Europe and America is not infidelity proper. That is, it is not the coarse infidelity of Hume, Paine, Volney, and Voltaire. It is certainly *not* Christianity; but it has its foundation in facts which ought to make the friends of Christianity blush for shame. There is a species of Rationalism which is simply the protest of the human intellect against the present corruptions of Christianity. It is an effort of the mind to get away from the slavery of ecclesiastical legislation, into the freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right of individual interpretation. The people have long felt that there was something wrong in the present manifestations of religion. Catholicism and Protestantism have alike failed to meet the demands of human nature. There has been, and is now, a wide-spread and growing conviction that neither of these is competent to develop man to the highest happiness in this life, or prepare him for the enjoyment of the life to come. Hence, what is frequently called infidelity, is not infidelity in fact, *but only a rejection of these systems.* And even where this rejection goes so far as to embrace true Christianity, it can be safely affirmed that, in nine cases out of ten, the cause is found in the present unreasonable manifestations of religion. Men are not going to be fools forever. They may lose their souls. In some Utopian voyage after the lights of human reason, they may go down to ruin; but it is braver and nobler to do this, than to live on from day to day in a religious life that is simply self-stultification. Hence, however we

may deplore the consequences of Rationalism, we can not help feeling a kind of sympathy and respect for those who have been driven to it, by the unfortunate condition of things in the religious world.

In this connection, it is important to remember another fact, namely, while Catholicism is losing its influence all over Europe, Protestantism is gaining no immediate strength from this declension of the mother Church. The gain is rather to the ranks of infidelity. Catholicism has recently lost heavily in Austria, Italy, Spain, and in fact almost every Catholic country; but the men who have grappled with its despotic government and hoary ritualism are not Protestants, but infidels—infidels of the type we have been considering—men who feel that there is something better for humanity than either Catholicism or Protestantism—that man has a nobler sphere than to live in the service of ecclesiastical dogmas, or bow to the edicts of ecumenical councils. We do not say that these men have any thing better to offer the people than the systems they reject; in fact, they seem to have no well-defined views of religion at all. They are simply iconoclasts, breaking down the images which now disgrace the religious and political society of Europe, without erecting any thing in their stead. Nevertheless, we are disposed to believe that all this work is in the right direction, and will ultimately end in great good to the social and religious condition of the people. Sometimes things have to get worse before they get better, and although the present demoralization of the Romish Church in Europe may be attended, for awhile, with some uncertainty as to the religious faith of the people, still we believe that a pure Christianity will be the gainer in the end; and, consequently, we are disposed to look with deep interest and much hope upon the great movements now in progress upon the European Continent.

In our own country the same elements are at work. And, although ecclesiasticism is now holding its iron sway over the minds of the people, it can not be denied that there is a restlessness everywhere manifest, which clearly indicates that the old foundations of religious society are beginning to shake. And, while we would not encourage you to expect too much for some time to come, we would, nevertheless, have you cherish the hope that the day is not far distant when the empire of human creeds will be destroyed, and the influence of sectarianism effectually and forever broken down. We

think that the signs of the times clearly indicate that the present state of things can not continue much longer. Every-where the people are calling for something better. Even the clergy are forced to acknowledge that their present systems are inadequate to the conversion of the world. And, while they hold on with terrible tenacity to their peculiar dogmas, they can not help feeling that their present divided and antagonistic efforts are wholly unequal to the great work of rescuing men from the terrible thralldom of sin.

What must be done? It is sometimes easy enough to detect the nature of disease, but to apply a specific remedy is much more difficult. Still, a good physician will always seek for the nature of the disease first, as this will greatly assist him in the treatment. We have already stated the main difficulty in the way of our religious progress. We have seen that Protestanism, which we have been accustomed to accept as the only hope of the world, is defective in three important elements of strength, namely, unity, certainty, and consistency. To give it efficiency it must have these three things; and it is quite useless to expect it to accomplish any great work while these things are wanting. In the first two, Catholicism finds fault with it; and in the last, Rationalism grounds its most unanswerable objections. Hence, to heal the defects of Protestantism, in the particulars noted, is the great religious problem of the present day. Or, to simplify the matter still more, to give *unity;* because to reach this it will be necessary to have both certainty and consistency. Consequently, in the treatment of the subject, we shall confine ourselves to the simple question of Christian union, or, How can the divisions of Protestants be healed?

In answer to this question, we wish to state distinctly and emphatically that we have no faith in mere *conventional* harmony. It is easy enough to unite bodies of men in external forms and ceremonies, but to unite them in *heart* and *life* is a much more difficult task. But *true* Christianity does not look so much to outer forms as it does to the condition of the soul. Hence, it is altogether possible for a convention of Protestants to adopt resolutions to unite upon some basis of union, and yet be very far from a union in its most important conditions. To be more specific, we mean this: it is not enough to bring about a mere formal union of *sectarians* on a *human* basis; but a union, to be permanent and effective in the great work of converting

the world, must be a union of *Christians* on a *divine* basis. Hence what we want first is UNITY—"unity of faith," "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace"—and then Christian union will follow. Heretofore we have attempted to do what God never intended should be done: we have attempted to settle all our difficulties in our *own way*, and have, in a great measure, lost sight of the fact that nothing can be done rightfully or successfully in religion that is not in accordance with the Divine will. We hold, then, that the first, and perhaps the most important, step in the direction of Christian union is to settle the question of AUTHORITY in all religious matters. Must we listen to the edicts of Popes, the decrees of councils, the affirmations of human creeds; or shall we reverently and earnestly accept the Word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice? Here is where the whole question turns, and vain are all other efforts until a decision is reached at this point. The question of authority lies at the very threshold of any effort at Christian union. And we do not hesitate to affirm that no permanent or desirable union of Christians can ever be effected unless the *Bible, and the Bible alone*, is first accepted as the only source of authority for all religious acts. We say the Bible *alone*, because all Protestants already claim to be guided by the *Bible;* but the trouble is, they do not confine themselves to its teachings *exclusively*. They *add to the Bible* the Articles of Augsburgh, Westminster, and such like ecclesiastical utterances. What we want is the Bible ALONE. Where it speaks, we should speak; where it is silent, we should be silent. We know that some good people suppose human creeds are necessary in order to determine who is evangelical. But a little reflection, we think, will satisfy any reasonable man that this question is not so easily decided, and that the popular phrase "Evangelical Christian" has a very uncertain and indefinite meaning. Let us look at this matter for a moment. The usual way of deciding the question as to who is evangelical is as follows: The Methodist agrees to call the Presbyterian "evangelical" if the Presbyterian will return the compliment. This the Presbyterian is generally willing to do. Hence, they two agree to call each other evangelical. And what they agree to call evangelical *is* evangelical; for the law is, "every thing shall produce after its kind." This is a fair statement of the popular manner of settling this question, except the Scripture quotation, which we have generously supplied for the benefit of all persons

who may hereafter reason in this way. But it is said, "a rule is a bad one that will not work both ways." Now, let us try this rule in another case. The Unitarian agrees to call the Universalist "evangelical," and the Universalist, in turn, agrees to call the Unitarian "evangelical," and what they agree to call evangelical *is* evangelical; therefore, Unitarians and Universalists are *evangelical!* How do creed-makers like this reasoning? and how do our orthodox brethren like the consequences of their own logic? All this inconsistency can readily be avoided by taking the Word of God alone as our guide in all religious questions. Let every man be free to examine it for himself; and in the light of its teachings, and in the conscientious fear of God, unite with all men who are like-minded in the glorious work of the world's redemption from the curse of sin.

But there is another question, of very great importance, that needs to be considered in this connection. We refer to the thing to be believed, in order to have the faith necessary to be a Christian. Is there no test on this subject? Are we left at liberty to believe any thing or nothing, as we may think proper? Certainly he who said, "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be who find it," would not have left his Church without some protection against an unworthy membership. The Scriptures assure us that the Lord's people are a "peculiar people;" that they "are not of the world," and that the "world is unworthy of them." It is clear, therefore, that the way into the Church is through some decided and definite test. That test is the "obedience of faith."

First, then, What is faith?

Second, What is the obedience that proceeds from it?

In order to decide these questions, we must let the Scriptures answer. What they say we must say; where they are silent we must be silent also. What, then, do they say on the first question? "He that believeth on the *Son* hath life." "Ye believe in God, believe also in *me*." "These things were written that you might believe that *Jesus the Christ* is the Son of God, and that believing you might have life in his name." "Believe on the *Lord Jesus Christ*, and thou shalt be saved." These quotations are sufficient to show that the thing to be believed is that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the Living God. And any addition to this simple proposition is not only unscriptural, but places the question of Christian

union beyond the bounds of possibility. It is not our business to ask any one his opinion in reference to this or that difficult theological question. We have nothing to do with his opinions, philosophies, or views in reference to any or all of the dogmas that have so long distracted and divided the Christian world; but we must simply say to him, in the language of the New Testament, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." Hence, we conclude that the faith of the Gospel is not *doctrinal*, but *personal;* not belief in a *dogma*, but in a divine and glorious *person*, "who is able to save to the uttermost all who come to God by him." This faith is sufficiently exacting to protect the Church from imposition, while, at the same time, it makes membership possible to every creature. This makes CHRIST the door into the Church, and whoever comes in any other way, "the same is a thief and a robber."

It is easy enough to declare that the man who does not hold the orthodox view of "original sin," "total depravity," "election and reprobation," etc., is not evangelical, and must, therefore, be excluded from the councils of those who regard themselves as special guardians of the faith; but whoever tells us that he believes with all his heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and does what that Christ commands, we will fellowship, and bid him God-speed as a brother Christian, though all sectarian bigots, from the Pope of Rome down to the smallest close communionist in the land, should denounce us as heretics, or turn away from us as "publicans and sinners."

Christ has not suspended salvation on theories and speculations. The Gospel tells the story of a personal sacrifice, a deep and heart-rending agony of the God-man for man. It comes to us with a warm and generous sympathy, from a heart that is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and bids us, even in our degradation, look up and hope. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father in heaven give good things to them who ask him." Away, then, with cold, lifeless dogmas; give them to the winds; and let Christians every-where rally around Him who is the "alpha and omega, the beginning and the end; the first and the last;" who is the "chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely."

But it is not enough to simply believe in Christ. Even devils

believe and tremble. You must do this; but you must do more than this. You must believe and OBEY. Hence faith in Christ, and obedience to his commandments, is the only test of fellowship in the Christian Church. Consequently, we must not only have faith, but we must have also "the obedience of faith." But just here another difficulty arises, as to what are the commands of Christ?

The difficulty is not so much as to the necessity of obeying the commands of Christ, as it is to determine exactly what those commands are. But this difficulty is very easily overcome, if we confine the investigation to the Word of God alone. The trouble is, that men will not do this. They prefer rather to listen to the decisions of councils and the utterances of human creeds; and, consequently, the plain and simple commandments of Christ are tortured into a thousand ungainly shapes before they get through these ecclesiastical interpretations to the people. We do not wonder that the people are perplexed, and forever in doubt as to their religious duties. It was never intended that the Gospel should be understood only by a few self-constituted ecclesiastics. It is for every creature, and its commandments are so easy of comprehension that the "wayfaring man, though a simpleton, need not err therein."

One mistake which theologians have generally made is, they substitute the philosophy of Christianity for its duties. This mistake has been fatal to the peace of the Church, and has greatly retarded the progress of the Gospel in the world. The philosophy of the human organism is a profound study, but the functions of the members of the body are simple and easy to be understood. For example: The peculiar structure of the eye is a profound and difficult subject for investigation, but the *use* of the eye is well understood by all men. Precisely so with the body of Christ. We may not fully understand its sublime philosophy—its wonderful mechanism, so to speak—but all the members of that body may know, assuredly, what are their respective duties. The commands of Christ have respect to duty, not philosophy; obedience, not theology. Hence, if Christians would ever be united upon the one "foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," they must forever abandon the fields of theological pugilism, and ascend to the sublime and glorious faith which accepts Christ at his word, and seeks to implicitly obey Him in all things.

Finally, if Christian union is ever an accomplished fact, those who now profess to be followers of Christ must first become more spiritually-minded. According to the Apostle Paul, the principal cause of division in the Church at Corinth was the carnality of its members. They were selfish, and sought only to gratify their selfish desires. Fleshly ambitions had to be satisfied, temporal interests provided for; and thus a thousand worldly lusts broke down the spiritual reign of Christ in the hearts of the members. Such a Church was an easy prey to the spirit of discord. Hence we hear the Apostle earnestly exhorting them to be more spiritually-minded, more Christ-like, more entirely consecrated to Him who had died for them, and washed them in his own precious blood.

The difficulty with the Churches to-day is very much the same as that which cursed the Church at Corinth. We are too selfish, too carnally-minded. We study the interests of *denominations*, rather than the interests of *Christ's cause*. We seek our own glory, rather than the glory of Christ. When men shall every-where abandon their own petty schemes, surrender their own vain ambitions, and bring every thought, every purpose, every word, and every work, to the foot of the Cross, and, with an honest and earnest desire for the peace of the Church and the conversion of the world, consecrate all to the service, the honor, and glory of Him who is "the resurrection and the life,"

"Our present hope and future joy,"

then, and not until then, can we hope for any permanent union among the followers of Jesus, or any success of the Gospel commensurate with the great wants of our suffering race.

Christianity must be more than a form, more than a mere profession, if it shall ever command the respect and govern the hearts of men. Christians must imbibe more of the spirit of their Divine Master, and then they will be led to greater acts of self-denial, and be encouraged to become more active and zealous in the great work to which they have dedicated their lives. Then can every one truly say:

"The dearest idol I have known,
Whate'er that idol be,
Teach me to tear it from thy throne,
And worship only Thee."

VIII.—THE UNION MOVEMENT—WHAT WILL COME OF IT?

ABOUT a half century ago, the visible and actual union of all the followers of Christ began, in a special manner, to reach the surface of religious thought and feeling. The seed was sown by the Savior in this world long before, but, like some other seed, it was a good while coming up. True, it did vegetate and bloom for a time, at the introduction of Christianity, but the plant was afterward lost amid the divisions and confusion of incipient Popery, and for fifteen hundred years the very phrase *Christian Union* has been a practical nullity among men. The unity claimed by the Church of Rome differs as much from *Christian union* as that Church differs from the Church of Christ. A union maintained by the sword and by their various ecclesiastical penalties, not only fails, in spite of the Inquisition and the stake, to prevent revolt and schism, but fails to realize the spiritual sympathies intended by the Lord, and actually accomplished, in the early days of the Church.

The German Reformation of 1517 demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining a unity of the Papal Church any longer, even by coercion. The impetus given at that time to public sentiment not only released Germany and Switzerland, and England and Scandinavia, from the Roman yoke, but has expressed itself rather too freely in taking different directions in the search after truth. This, too, was somewhat natural, although unfortunate—natural because the whole cyclopedia of religious knowledge was now to be explored, and a division of labor seemed almost necessary for a time, that afterward they might come together in one glorious brotherhood, bringing the accumulated stores of knowledge together, to realize finally the ineffable blessing of oneness in Christ.

As the human eye is incapable of taking in at once all the degrees in a great circle, so the intellect seems to be incapable of thoroughly investigating more than a few truths in a lifetime. It was no more possible for Luther to develop all religious truth, than it was for Copernicus to illustrate and prove all astronomic truth in his lifetime.

From the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus, from the shepherds who watched their flocks by night, till the sixteenth century, had the world believed the earth the center and axle of the whole physical universe. It was enough for one man to simply subvert this notion, and leave others to work out all subsequent problems. It was enough for Luther to prove that Rome and the Pope were not the center and hub of the kingdom of God on earth, and then leave Calvin, and all subsequent Reformers, to develop the after truths.

In making this division of labor, Calvin explored the field with more particular reference to Church organization and order, and the sovereignty of God; the Church of England fought the battle of the Pope's supremacy and religious toleration; while the Wesleys and Whitefield awakened the emotional nature of mankind, pouring the light and love of God into the soul till it felt that religion was a subjective, substantive, and conscious reality. Other exploring parties have gone out in other directions. The Baptists, long ago, proved Baptism to be immersion; the Congregationalists have developed the doctrine of Church independency, all bringing home valuable contributions of truth.

But the work was still incomplete. The time had come when a union of all parties, on the basis of that well-studied Book, was both practicable and important—a plea for which was made with almost matchless power by Barton W. Stone, Alexander and Thomas Campbell, Walter Scott, and others, about fifty years ago. This plea, treated with ridicule or indifference at first, has, nevertheless, been gradually gaining ground ever since, until, within a few years past, it has expressed itself in various ways that promise good results. Not to mention the nearly half a million of "Disciples of Christ" that have banded together to perfect the knowledge of God among men, and who have been pressing *the union of all who love God on the Bible as their creed*, for forty years, other indications of a favorable kind are manifest. Some have proclaimed a want of all confidence in the movements of the Evangelical Alliance; in the efforts of the eight different sects of Presbyterians who have been trying to unite; and in the propositions of a similar character recently before the Methodist General Conference, and the Episcopalian Convention; but to an eye that takes in a larger horizon, these are all tokens of immeasurable good to come. True, the Alliance has not accom-

plished its ends, and the Presbyterian effort has temporarily failed, and the other parties' projects are still uncompleted; but there is nothing discouraging in all this. The first efforts at a European Protestant Reformation by Huss and Jerome were failures, but, like the mighty pulsations of the earth, they indicated a coming strength that was not to be resisted.

It is also admitted that none of them have simply taken the Bible without note or comment as the basis of union, but have been patching and splicing their creeds, in the hope of producing a *tertium quid* to suit all; and in this they will certainly fail, for while the Bible always allows just enough margin for men to differ on, and leaves many things indefinite where accuracy is not necessary, the creeds, on the other hand, always preach a hide-bound theology that allows no liberty of thought, and seeks to be very exact in the mode of the Divine existence, and such like questions, on which the Bible has purposely left us much in the dark.

For these and other reasons, it is not likely that a satisfactory human creed will be generated. Still, the question of *Christian Union* will be pressed upon public attention, and can not be ignored. The various parties now so much and so happily concerned about this matter seem to be utterly unconscious of the fact, that they are very largely indebted to Alexander Campbell and his co-laborers for their present interest in this subject. Like other great and good men, they sowed seed that never came up till they were in their graves; and whether the present generation gives them any credit or not, they will be recompensed at the resurrection of the just. It was more than suggested by those pioneers in this movement, that all could unite on the Bible as a sufficient rule of faith and practice. This thought, though still rejected, will yet assert its right to reign and triumph over every other. Abstracts of doctrines, as in creeds, are like strong decoctions for food. It is better to take food in its bodily form, and better to take the Bible as a concrete than to abstract its teachings in any form.

The first practical result among the different parties will probably be the union of kindred sects of the same genus into one. All the Presbyterians will become United Presbyterians, forming one body. All the Methodists will unite, taking in the United Brethren and the Low Church of England. All Immersionists may also unite,

and thus the work may go on until the kindred species will resolve themselves into their respective genuses. Most of these consolidations may unite upon some sort of formula of doctrine at first, but after balancing themselves awhile, surveying the whole field, and, being encouraged by what has been done, another effort may be made for a final and general union of all who love God and the Bible. The growing tendency to distrust all the works of men will finally bring to the surface the great idea that the Bible, just as it is, must be our creed, as it will then be seen "to be profitable (and sufficient) for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." A new generation, freed from the prejudice growing out of controversy, will then be on the field, and the children will feel willing to do what their fathers could not accomplish. They will refuse an inheritance of bigotry, prejudice, and hate, and will cultivate broader views of truth and humanity, and will learn to eliminate the weightier matters of the law, instead of the mint, anise, and cumin.

As each species and genus of religionists shall have learned something in the respective fields of thought pursued by them, they can now bring their contributions together, and the parties being so reduced in number, the number of questions for settlement will be correspondingly decreased. The Presbyterians will have settled all the questions that divided them before they came into this final conference; the same may be said of all Baptist and Methodist parties. What a paternal and Christian conference can do toward reconciling real differences and dispelling imaginary ones was demonstrated a year ago, when fifteen ministers of the Baptist Church, and a like number of Disciples, met, and held a four days' consultation, in the city of Richmond, Virginia. Although a union was not effected, it was found that on many points, where they had thought the difference considerable, it was really very little; and in cases where they supposed they would find less difference, it amounted to nothing at all—the whole aggregate of difference, when well sifted, concentrating in the design of baptism. Who knows but a similar result might be approximated with others, if a proper effort were only made?

The chief question to be settled would likely be found in the proper action of baptism. But as all Pedobaptist authorities admit immersion to be right, as well as sprinkling and pouring, they would compromise nothing in adopting that practice. Then the immersion

question would be out of the way; and thus, step by step, an approximation could be attained near enough for all the practical ends of Christian coöperation and fellowship. Concession, of course, must be mutual, no party assuming to itself an infallible orthodoxy it would deny to others. There are certain difficulties, however, in the way which it would be unwise to ignore:

1. Most men fail to see how others can even be honest who deny what is so plain to themselves. They fail to rightly calculate the influences of education, mental habits, and even the different positions in relation to the same things, occupied by different persons. Some one has ingeniously invented a way of painting three different portraits apparently on the same canvas, so that if you stand directly in front of the frame you see a good likeness of Abraham Lincoln; remove to the left forty-five degrees of circle, and you recognize a fine likeness of General Grant; then move forty-five degrees to the right of the first position, and you see a good picture of General Sherman. Now place three persons at once in these three positions, respectively, and each one, looking at the same thing, will swear to a different portrait—and all alike honest. Different family culture and teaching, and different surroundings, generally paint many an object differently to us from what it is to another. On this point, then, the main lesson to be taught is faith in the *honesty* of other religious people, as they have nothing to gain by dishonesty.

2. But the chief difficulty of all arises from our unwillingness to grant toleration and fellowship to a mistaken brother long enough to admit of his growth in knowledge; or rather each one is very willing to admit the fallibility of his neighbor, but not his own, and hence prefers to take in all who differ from himself and his Church, as catechumens for better instruction. But if this most desirable end should ever be effected, each one must take up his Bible as a little child, with a heart fully resolved to accept every word of God without regard to consequences. It is better even to tolerate some mistakes in theory, and even in practice, for a time, if some grander good is about to be accomplished thereby. Choose the less of two evils whenever a choice is inevitable. If Christian union is worth more than weekly communion, or less, let choice be made accordingly, if need be. If Christian union is of more consequence than agreement on the doctrine of election, or less, pursue the same discriminating

course, and so on with regard to all other questions of religious interest. We accept a heathen into the Kingdom of God with less than a hundredth part of the qualification of some whom we reject in civilization. True, we ought to ask more of these than of those; and yet it must be admitted that all along the scale, from the true heathen convert, just "turned from his dumb idols," up to the full-grown "man of God," there may be found precious souls whom "God hath received," notwithstanding their ignorance and imperfections. The main question is—*Has he believed on the Savior, has he felt himself a sinner*, and is he striving for the Kingdom of God? *Is he willing to obey the plain commandments of God?* We are all far this side of Infinity, and it behooves us to be not too proud of our relative advancement on this first inch of the measureless line of infinite progression toward the perfections of God.

No one could easily be more deeply sensible than the writer of the indispensableness of our believing in the true divinity of Christ, the sinfulness of man, the intrinsic and subjective reality of religion, nor more opposed to all cheap views of the doctrine of the Atonement, the nature of sin, and the work of the Holy Spirit. I am not saying we should be latitudinarian as to any of these fundamental truths, for I am not contemplating a union with parties who deny them. The difficulty seems to be to induce those who agree on all these as the warp and woof of Christianity, to bear with one another in matters of far less magnitude, and that, too, when the object is to circumvent a far greater good. Some faults and differences, comparatively, of microscopic dimensions only, are examined with the strongest magnifiers, to discover deficiencies to be alarmed at; but the one whose eye sweeps the whole line of Jacob's ladder, blesses the struggling souls on every round thereof, compassionates their weaknesses, and bids them hope in God.

What a happy turn in our affairs if the present interest in Christian union should induce a cessation of controversy long enough to give us all time to see how near we agree, and to magnify the points of coincidence for awhile, and give our better feelings and love for humanity a chance to *thaw out* our frozen hearts. Eyeing the differences has been tried a good while; perhaps a change of tactics would be wholesome for all. Upon the whole, we can not but regard the movement under consideration as an omen of good;

a beginning must be made, and whether it expresses itself in the Evangelical Alliance, in the New York "Christian Union," in the "Young Men's Christian Union," in the Presbyterian, Methodist, or Episcopalian movement, it is to be regarded as an unfinished realization of what the brave pleaders for a return to primitive Christianity, *on the Bible alone*, have been striving for, through more than a generation of years. That the work may go on and accomplish more than eye hath seen or ear heard, or than ever entered the heart of man, must be the desire of every lover of Jesus Christ.

IX.—BISHOP—OVERSEERS.

I.—MEANING OF THE WORD BISHOP.

THE meaning of this word should be sought in the Scriptures by all who desire to understand the nature and extent of the office to which it relates. The sense attached to it by the Greek, Roman, and Episcopal Churches, is not in accordance with Scripture usage. There is no such officer as a Greek, Roman, or Episcopal bishop mentioned in the Old or New Testament. They regard a bishop as "a prelate, or a person consecrated for the spiritual government and direction of a diocese."

The writers of the New Testament may be supposed to have borrowed the word (ἐπίσκοπος) from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and to have used it in the sense in which it is used in that book, where it occurs.

Num. xxxi, 14: "And Moses was angry with the *Captains of the Army*—the heads of thousands, and the heads of hundreds, who came from the battle array." Here the word (ἐπίσκοποι) bishops, as translated in the common version of the New Testament, simply means commanders of thousands, and the commanders of hundreds—about equivalent to "Colonels" and "Captains" with us. These were military, not ecclesiastical bishops. Zebul is called the (ἐπίσκοπος) *bishop* of Jerobaal. Jud. ix, 28. This is not the ecclesiastic

use of the word. Brenton, the late translator of the Septuagint, renders the word by "Steward."

It is written, 2 Kings xi, 15, (Sept., 4 Kings xi, 15,) that Jehoiada, the priest, commanded the Captains of the hundreds, (ἑκατοντάρχοις τοῖς ἐπισκόποις) the officers of the host [army] to take Athalia forth and slay her "with the sword." Here the (ἐπίσκοποι) *Bishops*, or Captains, are called officers of the army.

In the eighteenth verse of the same chapter it is written, that "the Priest appointed (ἐπισκόπους εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου) *overseers* in the Lord's House;" that is, for the house, to take the oversight or care of it. This is neither a military nor ecclesiastic sense.

In Job xx, 29, and Wisd. i, 6, a Hebrew name (אל) of God is translated ἐπίσκοπος, *episcopos*, by personification, as we use the word Providence when we mean God. This is neither a military, ecclesiastical, nor civil use of the word.

Joel, the son of Zichri, was the (ἐπίσκοπος) *overseer* of nine hundred and twenty-eight of the sons of Benjamin, who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon. This is a civil use of the word.

In a prophecy relative to the glory and happiness of the people of God, occasioned by converts from the heathen, it is written, in the Septuagint, (καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρηνῃ, καὶ ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ,) *I will appoint thy rulers in peace, and thy overseers in righteousness.* This is an instance of the use of the word in relation to civil affairs.

Robinson defines it "*an inspector, overseer, guardian.*" It is used of *treaties*, by Homer, 11, 22, 225; Hdian, 7, 10, 6; *of laws*, by Plutarch, Sol. 19; *of laws*, by Homer, Od. 8, 163; *of cities*, by Josephus, Ant. 10, 4, 1; *of a patron*, as Minerva of Athens, Dena, 4, 26, 27. The Athenians called the magistrates, who were sent to tributary cities to organize, and to govern them, (ἐπίσκοποι,) *overseers*. Schol. in Aristoph. Av. 1023; Boeckh Staatshaush. der Ath. 1, pp. 168, 256; Neander Gesch. der Pflanz. u. Leit der chr. Kirche, 1, p. 178; and Bibl. Repos. iv, p. 254.—*Robinson.*

The New Testament furnishes the following instances of the use of the word:

I. Acts xx, 28. Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus and called the Elders of the Church, and told them that the Holy Spirit had made them (ἐπίσκοποι) *overseers* of the Church, to "feed" or tend it.

Concerning this passage let it be observed that two things are proved by it, namely:

1. That Elders and Overseers are officially the same.

2. That Elders and Overseers are Pastors. The Apostles told the Elders that the Holy Spirit made them *Overseers*, and he commanded them to (ποιμαίνειν) *tend* the Church of the Lord, which he also called "the flock." He who tends a flock is a pastor or a shepherd. These Elders, or Overseers, were required to tend a flock; therefore, they were required to be pastors, or shepherds.

3. They were the Elders of "the Church" in Ephesus, and of that Church only. They were Bishops, or Overseers, of one Church—not of many; of one Church in one city—not of the Church universal.

II. Phil. i, 1: "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the sanctified in Christ Jesus, who are in Philippi with Overseers and Ministers." *Ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις.* These overseers had the oversight of all the sanctified who were in Philippi—not in any other place. There is nothing in this, nor in the preceding passage, to justify either Catholic or Protestant Episcopacy.

III. 1 Tim. iii, 1, 2: "If any one is earnestly desirous of an overseer's office, he is desirous of a good work. An overseer must, then, be blameless," etc. The Apostle here speaks of the office and work of an overseer; and not particularly of the extent of his jurisdiction. There is, therefore, nothing said of any particular Church, nor of the Church universal.

His office is that of a ruler, and his work that of teaching. His ability to rule must be manifested in the good government of his house, or family. His ability to teach must appear from his aptitude for that work.

IV. Titus i, 5, 6, 7: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things which are deficient, and (καταστήσῃς) place elders in each city as I prescribed to thee." "For an overseer (ἐπίσκοπος) must be blameless as the steward of God." v. 7. He must "hold fast the faithful word," and be able, "by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers." This (οἰκονόμος) *manager of a household*, or "steward," explains the meaning of "overseer," as used in the New Testament.

V. 1 Peter ii, 25: "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are

now returned to the shepherd and overseer of your souls." Jesus is a *pastor*, as well as an overseer of souls. These are all the places in the New Testament where the word is found, and in neither of them is there the least support for the doctrine of episcopacy.

II. OVERSEERS—THEIR QUALIFICATIONS.

"*An overseer, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man knows not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God? Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of those who are outside, lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil.*" 1 Tim. iii, 2–7.

"*If any one* (εἴ τις) *is blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For an overseer must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to sordid gains; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding forth the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers.*" Tit. 1, 6–9.

These qualifications are required in every case. No man is eligible without them. He who has these is a Christian gentleman, and is an ornament to the Church, and a credit to its membership. It is well for Churches and Evangelists to study this subject thoroughly. The word "must" is understood before every phrase. Thus: An overseer must be blameless; must be the husband of one wife; must be vigilant; must be sober; must be of good behavior; must be given to hospitality; must be apt to teach, etc. Every thing is clearly and emphatically stated; and no Church should place any man in this office who does not answer the description. A thousand votes, and as many ordinations, can never make a Scriptural overseer of any man who fails to fill this description.

If any man desire this office he must strive to fill this bill. If

he finds himself deficient in any particular, he must discipline himself till he remedies the deficiency.

It is laudable to desire this office, because he who desires it, "desires a good work." It is honorable because it is good. The reward also is great. Peter says, that the faithful Elders "shall receive a crown of glory which fades not away, when the chief Pastor shall appear."

Twenty-four Elders occupy a very prominent place in the Revelation of Jesus Christ to his servant John. "And around the throne were twenty-four thrones, and on the thrones I saw twenty-four Elders sitting, clothed in white garments, and they had on their heads crowns of gold." iv, 4. "The twenty-four Elders fell down before Him who sat on the throne, and worshiped him who lives forever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power; for Thou hast created all things, and through Thy pleasure they exist, and were created." iv, 10, 11. "And one of the Elders says to me, Weep not. Behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has prevailed to open the book, and to loose its seals. And I beheld, and lo, in the middle of the throne and of the four living beings, and in the midst of the Elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him who was sitting on the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four living beings, and the twenty-four Elders fell down before the Lamb, every one of them having harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open its seals; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us kings and priests to our God; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels, around the throne, and the living beings and the Elders. And the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all

that are in them, I heard saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, to him who is sitting on the throne, and to the Lamb forever and ever. And the four living beings said, Amen. And the twenty-four Elders fell down and worshiped him who lives forever and ever." v, 1–14. See also, vii, 11; xi, 16; xiv, 3; xix, 4.

These passages show clearly that Elders, who are Elders indeed, will occupy an honorable and conspicuous place in the final development of the kingdom and glory of Christ. It is not wonderful, therefore, that their qualifications are of such a high order. Less than what is required would not be in harmony with the dignity of the office. It is not marvelous that these officers are not allowed to be given to wine, to be strikers, greedy of sordid gain, brawlers, covetous, novices, self-willed; but that they are required to be blameless, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, of good family government, of a good reputation among those outside, and to be lovers of hospitality, lovers of good men, and just, holy, and temperate. Let no man seek this office without these qualifications. Office is not an honor to incompetent men; but such are a dishonor to office.

There should be great care exercised as to who is inducted into this office. Young men should be specially trained for the work, that when they become settled in life, and of sufficient age and experience, they may enter this good work. It is well for these young men to devote some years to preaching while they are endeavoring to qualify themselves for the office of overseer. God bless and multiply such young men! We need a thousand of them now.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1.—*First Principles of Popular Education and Public Instruction. By* S. S. RANDALL, *Superintendent of Public Schools in the City of New York.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 256. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE author of this volume has enjoyed the highest advantages, both as to his education, his experience as an educator through many years, and as to his literary associations. Mr. Randall is no hobbyist, no schemer, and no enthusiast; the balance of all his powers is manifest in every article of his most excellent work. For example, he is neither infatuated with ideas of personal liberty in the parents to educate, or not to educate, their children for usefulness in the State, nor does he advocate the doctrine that the State owns the individual, and has a right to violate the liberties and sanctities of home, even for the ulterior purpose of producing the highest styles of citizenship. The rights of both are regarded, and their respective responsibilities marked out with that nice adjustment of thought which has given him his position among the educators of our country. Were the State, as in ancient Sparta, to claim the exclusive right to all children as soon as they can leave the nursery, thereby rupturing all filial and parental associations, a certain degree of mental, and even moral, culture might be reached by the youth of the land, but it would be at such an enormous expense of all the finer feelings that enter so largely into the warp and woof of a well-regulated life, that no well-informed legislator would nowadays advocate such a measure.

The education of the female sex during the last half century, or even the last quarter of a century, has formed one of the most marked features of our times. When Horace Mann, one of Mr. Randall's co-laborers, became State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Massachusetts, it is said that he found a bill somewhere in the Journals of that State, authorizing teachers to conduct the girls in arithmetic as far as to the *Rule of Three*, alleging that this would mark pretty well the limit of their capacity in mathematics. The removal of this deception from the public mind, and the actual development of said capacities to such an elegant degree of strength and refinement has, in the reaction, as is generally the case, oscillated to the other extreme. Here, again, Mr. Randall discovers the

equipoise that always characterizes those minds that are capable of being leaders among their fellow-men. The "*woman's rights*" fanaticism that seeks to drag her from the sanctum she now enjoys, and to shove her out doors to perform the duties of men, is nothing but a reaction from her former position. It would be a sad distribution of human forces, either to put the women out doors, or the men at household duties. We hear certain classes saying much about "man's sphere" and "woman's sphere," but, as Horace Mann once said—"Man has no sphere, and woman has no sphere; each of them has a hemisphere, and if you put them together they will make a sphere." But if either is to invade the responsibilities of the other, it will inverse the order of nature and of God. Give her all her rights, by all means, and among the rest, the right of exemption from going to the polls and from managing the affairs of State. Even if she has a right to dabble in political affairs, it is not what she desires; nor, as a general thing, could she well succeed at this business. She has a right to sing bass, but who would say it would be the best distribution of our musical forces? Still, as our author teaches, let her be educated in the highest degree, and qualified well for every position she can consistently fill.

But the pulse that should beat strongest in the great American heart should be for the *universal and free education of the masses*. Let the nation see to it, that her people be so cultured that not five per cent. shall appear in the lists of the ignorant. This she should do, taking even the lowest possible view of the case, for if there were no hereafter, no eternal state to be affected by mental and moral culture here, there are reasons enough this side the grave to command the exertions of every lover of humanity to secure this end. After limiting ourselves to the present life, we may still leave off all consideration of the personal weal of those to be educated, and in reasons of State alone, find enough to justify the authorities in requiring that every child in the land *shall* be educated. Let the following extract from Mr. Randall's work, page 244, confirm all, and more, than we have said:

"More than half the inmates of our prisons and penitentiaries of every grade are almost entirely destitute of the simplest rudiments of education; and of the residue, but a very inconsiderable proportion have enjoyed the benefits of even the lowest common-school instruction. The closest and most searching analysis of the records of crime, in our own city and State, for the past twenty years, will disclose the names of but very few individuals who have in early youth enjoyed the advantages of what, in accordance with the highest standard prevailing at the time, may be denominated a good education. Of 1,122 persons, being the whole number reported by the sheriffs of the different counties of this State, as under conviction and punishment for crime during the year 1847, 22 had received a 'common education,' 10 only 'a tolerably good education,' and 6 only were reported as 'well educated.' Of 1,345 criminals, so returned for the year, 1848, 23 only had a common, 13 a 'tolerably good,' and 10 only a 'good education.' The whole number of persons returned to the office of Secretary of State, as having been convicted of crime in the several counties and cities of the State during a period of nine consecutive years, from 1840 to 1848, both inclusive, was 27,949; of these, 1,182 were returned as having received a 'common education;' 414 as

having received 'a tolerably good education;' and 128 only as 'well educated.' Of the remaining 26,225 only about one-half were able to read and write. The residue were destitute of any education whatever. Of the 566 boys in the House of Refuge for juvenile delinquencies in this city, 287 had attended school less than six months, and only 41 had attended any public school in the city over three years. . . . The whole number convicted of crime in England and Wales in a single year was 20,984, of whom 7,033 were unable to read and write, 10,983 could read and write imperfectly, 2,215 could read and write well, while only 191 were superiorly instructed. In Scotland, out of 2,922 convicts, during the same period, but 55 were enumerated in the latter class, and 2,539 in the former."

The same results are given for Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and various pauper establishments of England and America; and it all goes to show that "the ranks of crime and vice are almost exclusively recruited from the ignorant classes of the community," and that precisely in the ratio that knowledge is increased, vice and crime recede.

The State, then, has an inalienable right, in self-defense, to see that her children are provided with such an education, intellectual and moral, as will protect her from the enormous expense of criminal procedure, if there was no higher assignable reason. But if the mental and moral culture urged by our author were only secured by a single city, or State, to serve as an example marked out on the board for all the rest to see, it would soon command the minds, the hearts, the hands, and the suffrages of all.

2.—*The New Testament History, with an Introduction, Connecting the History of the Old and New Testaments. Edited by* WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D., *Classical Examiner in the University of London.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 780. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

STUDENTS of the New Testament have long felt the need of just such a work as this, and Dr. Smith deserves, and will, doubtless, receive the gratitude of all students of sacred history, for the admirable work which he has written upon the important subject he has selected.

His work is divided into three parts. The first gives the connection between the Old and New Testament history, including the relations of the Holy Land to Persia, Egypt, and Syria. In this are narrated the main facts of the general history of the East, during what is called the "Hellenistic" age. And in order to preserve the unity of the subject, this part is very properly brought down to the destruction of Jerusalem. In an appendix which follows, there is a full account of the national and religious life of each separate section of the Jewish nation, their Scriptures, worship, and sects; in fact, every thing necessary to understand the condition of the people at the advent of our Savior.

The second book contains the Gospel history, and is designed to present a clear, harmonized account of the ministry of Christ, as related by the four historians, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Free use is made

of all needful collateral information, but the author has, very wisely, refused to enter upon speculative discussion. He has confined himself to known facts, and hence has given us a *reliable* history of Him "of whom Moses and the Prophets did write." The different views concerning Chronology have received considerable attention, while the appendix contains a discussion of the great question respecting the origin of the Gospels, and also a table of the Gospel Harmony.

The third book contains the Apostolic history, and aims at a completeness not previously attained in any similar work. This part is brought down to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that catastrophe is now exhibited in the light of the Savior's prophecy, as the epoch of his coming in the full establishment of the Christian Church.

Altogether we regard this work as one of the most useful contributions to sacred literature that has come under our notice for a long time. To those who are acquainted with Dr. Smith's great work, "The Dictionary of the Bible," we need not say more than that his "New Testament History" is characterized by the same painstaking, candor, and historical research which have made his Dictionary such an invaluable treasure.

Preachers, Sunday-school teachers, and students of the Bible generally will find in this volume even more than we promise for it. It can only be fully appreciated by being carefully and earnestly studied.

3.—*An Exposition and Defense of the Scheme of Redemption, as it is Revealed and Taught in the Holy Scriptures. By* R. MILLIGAN, *President of the College of the Bible in Kentucky University.* Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co. Crown 8vo. pp. 563. 1869.

WE wish that a copy of this volume could be placed in the hands of every preacher in the United States; for it would, assuredly, work a great reformation in the understanding and appreciation of the Scheme of Redemption.

President Milligan is a ripe scholar, has had long experience as an educator, in some of the best colleges of the land; is now President of the "College of the Bible," in Kentucky University, where he has not less than a hundred young men who are preparing for the ministry under his special instruction. He is, withal, an excellent preacher of the Gospel, a Christian of deep, earnest piety, and a man whose character is, in every way, a fine commentary on all that he writes.

From such a man, writing on such a theme, we ought reasonably to expect a valuable work. And we can conscientiously say that he has met our most sanguine expectations. In fact, the work is altogether better than we had supposed it would be.

It can not be said to be an *exhaustive* work, except so far as generalizations are concerned. It does not always elaborate as fully as some might wish, but we regard this *apparent* defect as one of the things for which the work may be recommended. It was not the intention of the author to consume time and space with needless verbiage. He has studied conciseness, and has succeeded admirably in this respect, though never at the expense of perspicuity. The work is highly *suggestive*, and, while sufficiently exhaustive for all practical purposes, it leaves something for the reader himself to do. He has the key placed in his hands that will open to him the door of almost all mysteries; that will reveal to him the most beautiful harmonies, in all the details of the Scheme of Redemption, from Adam to the end of the Apostolic ministry; but in order to completely master the whole subject, and come into the enjoyment of a knowledge of all the particulars, in the application of the great truths eliminated to the affairs of human life and human destiny, the reader must do some thinking himself, must seriously and earnestly meditate upon the great generalizations which President Milligan has furnished him.

While we thus speak in these high terms of commendation, we do not wish to be understood as fully assenting to all that is in the book. There are some things we could wish were different. But where there is so much to commend, and so little to condemn, we do not choose to discuss that part of the work to which we might take exception.

There are some chapters that are especially worthy of notice. We do not remember to have seen any thing better on the subjects of Sacrifice, Design and Character of the Law, Legal Types, etc., than what is said of these in this volume. The chapter on Types is invaluable. We doubt whether there is any thing better in the English language. In fact, we are certain that no other work gives the Scriptural meaning of types so well.

It is impossible, in a notice of this kind, to do justice to such a work. To give any thing like a fair analysis of its contents, it would be necessary to copy almost the entire work, for every thing is already as concisely put as can conveniently be done. To appreciate the work it must be carefully studied, read, and re-read, and all who will do this will be amply rewarded for their time and labor. To preachers, Sunday-school teachers, and all earnest students of the Word of God, President Milligan's book can not fail to be of inestimable value.

4.—*Poems by* Jean Ingelow. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. 2 vols. in 1. pp. 313–332. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

So much has been said of this popular authoress, both here and in England, it is almost needless to do more than announce the different

titles by which her works are designated, in order to enlist the public favor. No English poetess, save Mrs. Browning, ever commanded such a host of enthusiastic admirers in so brief a space of time. From the period of her first publication, in 1863, her success has been unparalleled. Of her first collection of poems, more than forty thousand volumes have been sold already; of the "Story of Doom" (an imaginative account of the antediluvians, and the escape of Noah and family) ten thousand; of her prose works, about fifteen thousand. Miss Ingelow is a native of Boston, in Lincolnshire, one of the oldest of English towns. Her father was a banker, and her mother is of Scotch descent. Being one of eleven children, her life was passed amid the family circle, where she had the advantage of pious instruction, and an early acquaintance with scenes calculated to develop the richest treasures of her mind and heart. Her writings are deeply imbued with her strong, intellectual, and religious nature, and no appreciative reader can fail of being impressed by her love for nature and reverence for its great Creator.

Her poems are graphic sketches of life in all of its varied phases, and it is, therefore, difficult to give such selections as we would like to do, in this brief and imperfect notice, lest we mar their beauty by interrupting the continuity of thought or description. Like the works of all great masters, they should be viewed as a whole, lest some rare beauty of design be overlooked, some magic tint or shadow be disarranged, or some combination of sweet sounds left out of the grand oratorio. Almost every subject has received new interest from her pencil. The homely scenes of daily life are enhanced, the face of nature glows with fresh beauty, while each of its mysterious voices conveys to her cultivated ear rich undertones of harmony unheard by the passing throng.

"The Songs of Seven" are, perhaps, more universally admired than any of her other poems, embodying, as they do, the different stages of woman's life, from early infancy to old age, with all its intermediate variety of "Romance," "Love," "Marriage," "Maternity," "Widowhood," and "Longing for Home." These songs are now published with twenty-seven splendid illustrations, forming a choice volume for all lovers of the beautiful, and is in itself a high compliment both to the fair authoress and its publishers.

There is a great variety in the subjects treated by Miss Ingelow, and, as before stated, no brief quotations from any of her poems can do them or herself justice. The sentimentalist, or poet, will linger with delight upon many passages in "Divided," "The Star's Monument," "Scholar and Carpenter," and "The Letter L," while graver scholars may gather fresh inspiration from "Brothers and a Sermon," "A Dead Year," "Honors," and "The High Tide," a sad, sweet story of real life. Miss Ingelow has other attractive qualities than those of a mere authoress to commend her to

American readers. She is noted for her beneficence, and devotes nearly all the gains received from the sale of her works in this country to the poor, especially to discharged hospital patients unable to earn their own support. Thus ministering to the physical wants of humanity as well as to its highest spiritual needs, she fulfills no common mission. We predict for her a glorious future. Her genial, sympathetic nature, matured by years of rich experience, can not but prove a blessing to the world, awakening in other hearts kindred impulses and aspirations, and in the years to come, whatever fame or glory may be hers, we trust that, like her own ideal poet, she will still continue

> "To teach
> Mankind, her peers, the hidden harmony
> That underlies God's discords, and to reach
> And touch the master-string, that like a sigh
> Thrills in their souls, as if it would beseech
> Some hand to sound it, and to satisfy
> Its yearning for expression."

5.—*Where is the City?* Second Edition. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. x—349. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The question propounded in this volume is certainly one of great interest. It is an inquiry for the True Church. The author seems to be deeply in earnest in pressing this inquiry, and shows considerable knowledge of the various religious parties in the United States. You follow him through his various experiences among the Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Quakers, Swedenborgians, Spiritualists, Universalists, and Unitarians with a profound interest. But when you come, at last, to "finding the city," you are sadly disappointed. You feel that the whole thing has been "much ado about nothing." For, if that is truth which every man conceives to be the truth, then it matters not whether a man is a member of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or any Church at all. In fact, we rather suspect that Israel Knight has become so bewildered by the various religious parties in the land, that he has concluded that it is not necessary to belong to a Church at all. And this seems to us to be the conclusion to which he at last comes.

Now, we confess a deep sympathy for an earnest man who starts out with an honest purpose to find the Church of Christ. In the midst of the Babel confusion upon this subject, he will have a difficult and laborious task. And, as Israel Knight seems to be an earnest and honest man, we are sorry that he made the fatal mistake of seeking for "The City" among the religious denominations into which Protestant Christendom is divided. Had he gone to the "Living Oracles" instead of the various religious parties, he might have received light that would have been of service to him. Men,

who are troubled about where to find the Church, should go to Christ and his Apostles for instruction, for these alone can unerringly lead the anxious and earnest heart to that "City having foundations, whose builder and maker is God." But men who seek for the Church among the sects of a distracted and divided Protestantism, or despotic, sensuous, and unlettered Catholicism, will not be likely to come to any wiser and juster conclusion than Israel Knight has done. In the investigation of this question the Word of God *alone* must be relied on to guide to a correct conclusion. And when this is studied with prayerful sincerity, it will not be difficult to find the Church of Christ. And when found, it will be seen that the whole subject of membership in that Church depends upon a hearty acceptance of these simple conditions, namely: Faith in Christ, and obedience to his commandments.

6.—*Seekers After God. By the Rev.* F. W. FARRAR, M. A., F. R. S. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Cr. 8vo. pp. xiv—336. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

This volume treats of three extraordinary characters, namely: Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius. They were all pagan writers, but are claimed by Dr. Farrar as worthy to be ranked among the "Seekers after God." Of these three, Seneca is the most extensively known, but his character, as an upright man, does not bear comparison with either of the other two. Few men have lived, whose characters were more unsullied than Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius; and though it is certain that neither ever made a profession of the Christian religion, it is difficult to believe they did not have constant intercourse with the early Christians. In fact, it is almost certain that they were familiar with the writings of Christ and his Apostles. Dr. Farrar labors very hard to show that Seneca had no special knowledge of the Apostle Paul, at least that Seneca's position was such that it is altogether improbable that he would have "stooped from his superfluity of wealth and pride of power, to take lessons from obscure and despised slaves, in the purlieus inhabited by the crowded households of Cæsar or Narcissus." And yet, it is altogether more probable that he did this, than that he should have said so many things so similar to the teachings of Scripture, without this intercourse.

To show the similarity between the Bible and Seneca's teaching we present a few passages in comparison:

Bible: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

Seneca: "God is near you, is with you, is within you; a sacred spirit dwells within us, the observer and guardian of all our evil and our good . . . there is no good man without God."

Bible: "All things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do."

Seneca: "It is no advantage that conscience is shut within us; we lie open to God."

Bible: "We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device."

Seneca: "Even from a corner it is possible to spring up into heaven; rise, therefore, and form thyself into a fashion worthy of God; thou canst not do this, however, with gold and silver: an image like to God can not be formed out of such materials as these."

Bible: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Seneca: "You must live for another, if you wish to live for yourself."

Bible: "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust."

Seneca: "How many are unworthy of the light! and yet the day dawns. The gods begin to confer benefits on those who recognize them not, they continue them to those who are thankless for them."

7.—*A Book about Dominies—being the Reflections and Recollections of a Member of the Profession.* Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 261. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The style of this volume is pleasant, racy, and very readable. It is full of good practical and every-day thought. It belongs to that class of books that has broken away from the old leaden way of putting things. It goes upon the principle that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. Instead of dealing in abstractions and dead issues of even a year ago, it sees the follies and stupidities of to-day, and cares not who is hit.

The chapter entitled "Something about Fools" would be an invaluable contribution to that class of our fellow-citizens who ought to see themselves as this Dominie sees them. It is very touching. Hear him:

"And here drive past two fools of the same kind, but of the other sex. They, too, have bartered the simple comeliness and the innocent pleasures of nature for the shallow gilding of art, and the tiresome excitement of fashion. They look very beautiful and proud as they recline elegantly in that padded carriage; but, after all, they are only what they seek to be, masses of silk, steel, and ribbon, with a substratum of flesh and blood, and the sickly remains of a human heart, that God's goodness gives to all, and man's folly can never entirely take away from any."

Other fools get their portion of meat in due season, and with a little more seasoning in it than will be palatable to many of them.

As to the article headed "Something about Sermons," we can not speak with so much praise. True, the author hits off a great many stupidities sometimes found in Church, and even connected with the pulpit. So far it is all well, for the pulpit should not be exempt from criticism, if done in a wholesome way. But there is little to be gained by an author announcing himself a "skeptic," and then pursuing his strictures upon the Churches and the preachers in such a manner as to leave no doubt on the mind of the reader that the Church of Christ shares but little in his sympathies. And, moreover, if there are a few men who "stealthily" preach other men's

sermons, it is unfair to spread the charge over ministers generally. A teacher of youth, as Dominie has been for years, ought to point out the faults of all classes of men honestly, and, at the same time, carefully avoid inculcating any disrespect of religion itself. One apology for the author, however, ought to be made—that he, perhaps, had certain very formal or corrupt forms of Christianity before his mind, and not the simple worship of God in a really Christian Church.

With the above exception, the book is well worth buying, and then well worth reading—valuable to "boys," to parents, and especially to teachers, who may receive many a practical hint that will never come amiss in the management of their schools.

8.—*Over the River; or, Pleasant Walks into the Valley of Shadows, and Beyond. A Book of Consolations for the Sick, the Dying, and the Bereaved. By* THOMAS BALDWIN THAYER. Boston: The Universalist Publishing House. 1867.

This volume is full of tender thoughts concerning a subject of the deepest interest to every one. No matter whether a man is an infidel or Christian, he can not be entirely indifferent to his state "over the river," or while passing through "the valley of the shadow of death." Much has been written upon the subject of death and the life beyond, but we are constrained at last to say that we know nothing of these except what is revealed to us in the Scriptures. Still, works that point us to Him who brought "life and immortality to light, through the Gospel," are always worthy of earnest consideration.

This volume of Mr. Thayer, though not always free from error, and often treating the subject in a somewhat speculative style, may, nevertheless, be read with much profit and consolation by those for whom it is intended.

9.—*Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms. By* ALBERT BARNES, author of "Notes on the New Testament," "Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity," etc. Vol. 1. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. xlvi–374. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The sphere of Albert Barnes as a commentator may be defined by the term "*useful.*" He is never profound, not often very elaborate, but, nevertheless, is almost always quite exhaustive of all that is necessary to be said concerning the subject he treats. His works are, therefore, highly practical, and, as such, are much more valuable to the general student of the Bible than works of greater pretensions.

The Book of Psalms is a portion of the Word of God that needs to be treated in a practical manner. There is in this book an expression of almost every variety of feeling; sentiments appropriate to almost every variety of circumstance in life; and, when properly understood, is full of highly important instruction, not only as an historical and poetical production, forming an important link in the chain of sacred literature prior to the coming of Christ, but furnishes the follower of Jesus with much that is practical and useful in the experiences and details of the Christian life.

Under the masterly but simple treatment of Albert Barnes this portion of the Word of God will certainly become more popular, as well as be better understood than it has heretofore been.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

10.—*Friederich Schleiermacher. Ein Lebens- und Characterbild. Zur Erinnerung an den* 21. *November*, 1768. *Für das Deutsche Volk bearbeitet von* DR. D. SCHENKEL. Elberfeld: 1868. (Friederich Schleiermacher. A Picture of his Life and Character. In remembrance of the 21st November, 1768. Written for the German People by Dr. D. SCHENKEL.) 8vo. pp. viii, 605.

ONE way of celebrating the hundredth anniversary of a great man's birth is to write a book about him. In Germany this is the usual way. Within the last few years there have been several occasions for this kind of literary activity. The centenaries of Fichte, Jean Paul, and Schleiermacher have all been celebrated in this and other ways. During the present year the patriot, poet, and historian, Ernst Moritz Arndt, ("Father Arndt,") and the great naturalist, Alexander von Humboldt, will doubtless have to undergo this centennial commemoration; and next year Hegel, the great philosophical *rarefier*, and in a few years, Schelling, the great philosophical *mystifier*, will come in for their share of centennial immortality. And we must confess that we think this custom a laudable one, and especially when upheld by those who believe in no other kind of immortality. Then, too, to a certain extent, we are all made participants in the benefits of this periodical hero-worship; for by this means we generally become more intimately acquainted with the objects thereof, and with the claims which they have to the grateful remembrance of posterity. We should certainly be glad if men like Schleiermacher could become more generally known in America, whether by this or any other means. To be sure this is a name which we very often hear in theological circles, and meet with in our theological periodicals, but it would not, probably, be far from the mark to say that real acquaintance with the man and his work is in the inverse ratio to

the frequency with which he is mentioned. Probably no man has had a greater influence on the theology of the present century, not only in Germany, but every-where where the results of German thought and research, be these results heterodox or orthodox in their tendency, have become known to any considerable degree. Himself ignoring all mere party names and affinities, he has been appropriated by all parties, so that his name, like Hegel's, has become an apple of discord between the various ecclesiastical factions.

In this state of the case we can not but be thankful to Dr. Schenkel for his exhaustive and impartial exhibition of the life and character of the great theologian. One may be far from agreeing with the peculiar theological views of Schenkel, and yet recognize his great talent as a popular theological writer, and particularly his talent in the presentation of living pictures of historic men and times. The period in which Schleiermacher's life falls is one of the most interesting in the whole intellectual history of Germany, and a description of this life must be, in order to give the necessary perspective, to a certain extent, a history of the period itself. In other words, it must show how the life and development of the man was conditioned by the influences which surrounded him, how he acted upon them, and how they reacted upon him. This is a difficult task, and yet we think the author has succeeded in performing it.

11.—*R. Rothe's Nachgelassene Predigten. Herausgegeben von* Dr. D. Schenkel. *Mit einem Lebensbild des Verewigten. Erster Band. Predigten aus den Jahren* 1824–28, *in der Evangelischen Gemeinde zu Rom gehalten.* Elberfeld. (R. Rothe's Posthumous Sermons. Edited by Dr. D. Schenkel. With a Biographical Sketch of the Deceased. Vol. 1. Sermons preached in the Evangelical Church in Rome, in the years 1824–28.) 8vo. pp. 528.

Richard Rothe was one of the most remarkable men of the present century—"the greatest German theologian since Schleiermacher," as he has often been called. He was a philosopher and a professed Christian; a theologian of the most positive opinions, a great writer, (not however in the voluminous sense,) and yet without a particle of theological acrimoniousness, of that *odium* peculiar to the tribe, in his composition. Probably no one ever came into personal contact with him without being inspired with love and veneration for him, whether agreeing or disagreeing with his opinions. It is true, that, although believing in the supernatural character of Christianity, and insisting in the most marked and positive manner on the absolute necessity of Christianity, as the means of salvation to mankind, he became in his later years a rock of offense to the whole brood of dogmatists. With him Christianity was not a bundle of dogmas, but a life, drawing sustenance from the great fountain of life in Christ. He did not

believe in making a man's orthodoxy depend on subscription to a creed, knowing very well that no mere "rightness" of intellectual assent, no adhesion to certain prescribed formulas, can be a guarantee of "rightness" of the inward and generative principle of moral and religious life. Not that he underestimated the value of correct views. He devoted a large part of his life to the elaboration of a grand system of theology and religion, on which he was permitted, before his departure, to lay the finishing hand in the second edition of his "Theological Ethics."

It is a source of peculiar gratification to us to become acquainted, through the above volume, with the earlier period of Rothe's activity. The sermons were preached during the time that he held the office of Chaplain to the Prussian Embassador in Rome, which latter office was then filled by Baron Bunsen, who, in a poem inserted in the second volume of his "Hippolytus," has erected an enduring monument to their friendship. The sermons are filled with tender and glowing piety, as all of Rothe's efforts are. Through all his works, however difficult and abstruse the particular subject he handles may be, one feels the breathings of a supremely religious spirit. Would that some competent hand could be found to translate him for the benefit of the English-reading public.

12.—*Geschichte des Zeitalters der Reformation*, 1517–1648, *von* Ludwig Häusser. *Herausgegeben von* Wilh. Oncken, *Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Heidelberg. Berlin:* 1868. (History of the Age of the Reformation, 1517–1648. By Ludwig Häusser. Edited by Wilhelm Oncken, Professor of History in the University of Heidelberg.)

The above posthumous work of the late Professor Häusser is a valuable contribution to the history of the Reformation. While the celebrated work of Ranke makes us acquainted with all the minute details connected with that history, and plunges us, as it were, *in medias res*, so that sometimes we can not see the forest for the trees, the work before us places us at a certain altitude above the actual strife, where the dust and smoke of the battle can not reach us, and lets us look down upon it. Furthermore, Ranke devotes himself almost exclusively to the Reformation in Germany, while Häusser treats of its rise and progress in all the principal Protestant countries. Belonging to the school of Schlosser, Häusser takes a high rank among modern historians. He was, for a series of years, one of the chief attractions at the University of Heidelberg. His lecture-rooms were always filled to overflowing. As the science to which he devoted himself may be said to be the one to which all others converge, and in which they are resumed, so his lecture-room was a point to which the students from all the various faculties inevitably gravitated. He was a man of rare qualifications for a public

speaker; when warmed with his subject his eloquence flowed like a mighty torrent, sweeping every thing before it. His lectures, though carefully prepared, were never written, and so had all the freshness and vigor of immediate production. This being the case, Häusser left few manuscripts behind him; so that the reproduction of his lectures, for the benefit of the reading public, is naturally attended with great difficulties. It is, therefore, a piece of rare good fortune, that a man like Professor Oncken, who is recognized as one of Häusser's most gifted students, was in a position to undertake the publication of the course of lectures on the history of the Reformation. He had made a full stenographic report of them for his own use as a student, and has performed his duty of editor so well that competent judges are unanimous in the opinion that he has reproduced the whole spirit of the master's oratory.

As a specimen of the author's style, and of the spirit in which he handles his great subject, we translate the following paragraphs from the section which treats of Luther's translation of the Bible:

"One is often tempted to ask how it came that this nation, which, ever since the sixteenth century, had been so terribly afflicted by internal and external convulsions, preserved in its depths an indestructible kernel of religious and moral culture, which was not always to be found among the upper strata of the people, (where men were only too ready to give themselves over to foreign influences,) but which remained alive precisely in the lower classes, and which neither the devastations of the Thirty Years' War, nor the deluge of foreignism in the following generations, could disturb? *It came from the fact that with us no cottage was so small, no household so poor, that this book did not find a place in it*—from the fact that Luther's Bible became for the people, properly so called, not merely a book of prayers and devotions, but a book of general family reading; in a word, the whole intellectual world in which the young grew up, and to which the aged returned; the book in which the common man wrote his family history, noting the days of interest connected with his loved ones; the book from whose contents the weary and heavy-laden drew comfort and relief in the hour of distress. This book, the wars, which made a great graveyard, a smoking ruin, of our beautiful Father-land, could not exterminate. When our scholars began again to write Latin, and our cultivated classes to write and speak French, from the solid body of our nation this could not be torn away.

"For the preservation of the sound spirit of our people, which no foreign caricature, no foolish aping of the fashions of the day, could ever corrupt, this book was a panacea beyond comparison. Out of the simple homes of our country parsons, of our citizens and farmers, who regarded Luther's Bible as their all in all, the Reformers of the eighteenth century came forth, and when they began to purify our beautiful language from disfiguring foreign accretions they went back to the inexhaustible treasury of this book, and they found the most lively sympathy, not among the aristocratic scribes, with their learned pedantry, but in the circles where Luther's Bible, ever since the sixteenth century, had remained the standard. Here the deep emotional nature, the 'inwardness' of the German mind, sought and found full satisfaction. This reacted also on our Catholic countrymen, although only at second-hand. And that other part of our character, which impels us to appropriate and assimilate foreign elements of culture, found here a steady, healthy counterpoise, a counterpoise in which the Romanic nations are wanting."

13.—*Natürliche Schöpfungs-Geschichte. Gemeinverständliche wissenschaftliche Vorträge über die Entwicklungslehre im Allgemeinen und diejenige von Darwin, Göthe und Lamarck im Besonderen, über die Anwendung derselben auf den Ursprung des Menschen und andere damit zusammenhangende Grundfragen der Naturwissenschaft. Von* Dr. Earnst Hæckel, *Professor an der Universität Jena. Mit Tafeln, Holzschnitten, systematischen und genealogischen Tabellen. Berlin:* 1868. (Natural History of Creation. Popular Scientific Lectures on the Development Theory in general, and on that of Darwin, Gœthe, and Lamarck, in particular, and on the application of the same to the Origin of Man, and to other Fundamental Questions of Natural Science connected therewith. By Dr. Earnst Hæckel, Professor in the University of Jena. With woodcuts and systematic and genealogical tables.) pp. xvi–568.

One of Rothe's favorite ideas in the last years of his life, one to which he devoted a large share of his interest and attention, was the reconciliation of Religion with the culture of the modern world, or, as it is sometimes called, the reconciliation of Religion and Science. Of course, he did not fail to see that something more is necessary to this end, than the mere desire of theologians to press modern science into the service of the Church. He saw very clearly that there must be an equally strong desire on the other part *to come in*, without which, all mere ecclesiastical pressure would be of non-effect. So, in his celebrated Eisenach-theses, he called upon those estranged from the Church, the men of modern culture, to come out of their indifference toward every thing ecclesiastical, telling them that they must learn to place a proper estimate upon the importance and the actual power of Religion, of Christianity, and of the Church—telling them, furthermore, that without religion, human society has no permanent basis, and no soul, and that modern society has its foundation, its very root, in Christianity. He thought that if they could be brought to see this, they would conquer their chronic ecclesiophobia, and that, on the other hand, their reëntrance into the Church would be, for the latter, one of the most effectual motives to reform. But the difficulty is in bringing these men to this point of view. Whether there be any real contradiction, any absolute incompatibility, between Religion and Science, or not, (and certainly we do not think there is,) it can not be denied that there is, at present, a very marked degree of incompatibility between theologians and men of science. We should not be surprised if, in the end, it should be found that the cause of all the bickering and strife lies in the fact that neither of the parties understands the other. At any rate, we have in the author of the book whose title stands at the head of this notice, a man who, from the scientific side of the house, will have nothing to do with religion or Church, as they at present exist. And yet, to all theologians capable of appreciating the ancient motto, *fas est et ab hoste doceri*, (it is right to learn even from an enemy,) we would recommend his

book. Ten years ago it was the fashion in theological circles to speak of the Development Theory as a defunct and highly malodorous hypothesis. This is a way we have of disposing of things that do not suit us. All will remember what an unpleasant thrill ran through the theological world at the appearance of Mr. Darwin's book, in November, 1859. Since then it has become very evident that the Theory of Development, true or untrue, is any thing but dead. We are of the opinion that it can not be reconciled with Revelation; and, therefore, those engaged in the arduous but necessary task of reconciling Religion and Science will have to show that it is unscientific. Now, one of the best ways (some think it a *conditio sine qua non*) of refuting a theory is, to begin by trying to understand it. It really seems to be essential to know something about the origin, history, and scope of a given error before attempting to overthrow it. And whatever else we may have against the author before us, we feel bound to give him credit for producing, in the twenty lectures composing his book, not only a faithful exposition, but a complete history of the subject treated. He deserves, and will command, the respect of both friends and enemies; although, for our own part, we must say that we should have been glad to have missed certain indications of a bitterness commonly supposed by scientific men to be peculiar to our cloth.

14.—*Novum Testamentum Græce, Ex Sinaitico Codice omnium antiquissimo, Vaticana itemque Elizeviriana lectione notata Edidit Ænoth. Frid. Const. Tischendorf, Dr. Theol. et Phil. Palaeogr. Bibl., etc. Cum Tabula. Lipsiæ:* F. A. Brockhaus. 1865.

We presume our readers already have some knowledge of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, discovered by Prof. Tischendorf, yet a few facts connected with it can not fail to be interesting to all students of the Word of God. The following account of the discovery is from *St. Cuthbert's Magazine:*

"It was not until January, 1859, that he found himself, for the third time, within the walls of St. Catherine's, on Mount Sinai, being warmly welcomed by the Superior, Dionysius, with the words, 'God wishes you to discover new columns to support Divine truth.' During his stay, every facility was afforded for the examination of the literature of the monastery; nevertheless, the visit seemed likely to be as unsuccessful as the last, as regards its immediate object, (although several valuable books were found,) when a chance circumstance placed the long-looked-for manuscript in his hands. Preparations for departure were being made, when the steward of the monastery, into whose little cell he happened to enter, informed him that he also had a 'Septuagint,' taking down a bundle of dusty parchments which he placed in his visitor's hands, who, in a few moments, was convinced that the very leaves seen in the basket in 1844, but sought in vain on the last occasion, were there, as well as a great portion of the Bible. On closer examination he found the principal part of the Old Testament, the New Testament complete, with the 'Epistles of Barnabas,' and the 'Shepherd of Hermas.' On this occasion the guest was careful not to be overmuch pleased simply asking to be allowed to take the volume to his cell for examination. His own words.

however, best convey the delight really felt: 'Full of joy, I asked, as if in a careless way, for permission to take the manuscript into my sleeping chamber, to look over it more at leisure. There, by myself, I could give way to the transports of joy which I felt. I knew that I held in my hand the most precious Biblical treasure in existence—a document whose age and importance exceeded that of all the manuscripts which I had ever examined, during twenty years' study on the subject. I can not now, I confess, recall all the emotions which I felt in that exciting moment, with such a diamond in my possession. Though my lamp was dim, and the night cold, I sat down at once to transcribe the 'Epistles of Barnabas.' As the monks did not appear willing to part with the treasure, there seemed no way to utilize the discovery except by copying the whole. To do this accurately was no easy task, as it contained one hundred and ten thousand lines, together with many thousand corrections in other hands, at subsequent times. The difficulty was also greatly increased by the condition of the writing, which, in some places, was so faded as to be almost illegible, even to one well versed in ancient Greek manuscripts. Permission was, however, given to take the book to Cairo, where it could be copied at leisure. While the work was progressing, it was suggested to the monks that the gift of such a treasure would be most acceptable to the Emperor of Russia—the acknowledged head of their Church—who always took so lively an interest in its members.' The consideration of this proposal occupied a long time, partly owing to a vacancy in the office of Prior, without whose sanction it would be impossible to make so important a gift. The conclusion arrived at is well known, and in November of the same year Dr. Tischendorf had the satisfaction of laying before the Emperor, as the result of his labors, a most valuable collection of manuscripts of various dates; but conspicuous among them, like

'Some bright, particular Star,'

shone one well worth all the labor and time spent in obtaining it, '*The Codex Sinaiticus.*'"

The following is a list of the other manuscripts Professor Tischendorf laid before the Emperor: 1. Twelve Palimpsists; 2. Twenty Uncial Greek; 3. Twenty-two Cursive Greek; 4. Nine Syriac; 5. Eleven Copts; 6. Seven Arabic, with some fragments of Turkish; 7. Nine Hebrew, of the most ancient and rare Rabbinic recensions; 8. Five Armenian; 9. Two Papyrus, with a Greek astrolabe.

In 1862, the Emperor ordered three hundred copies of the *Codex Sinaiticus* to be published—a *fac simile*, in folio, of the original—two hundred copies of which were presented to the principal public libraries of Europe, and the remaining hundred generously given to the editor, in grateful remembrance of his distinguished services. About a year later the first edition of the New Testament—with the title at the beginning of this notice—was published, in the ordinary Greek characters.

This manuscript is a valuable contribution to Biblical criticism and sacred literature. In many places the text differs from the authorized English version of the New Testament Scriptures, but these differences always serve to remove obscurities, and shed additional light on the sacred volume. The manuscript was written, most probably, in the time of the Emperor Constantine; hence its antiquity gives it great weight in determining the true reading of disputed passages of the Bible. We are confident its discovery will lead to a better understanding of the Sacred Oracles.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

1.—*Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche.* 1869. *Erstes Quartalheft.*

The present number of the above Lutheran Quarterly contains four exegetical articles; one on the hundred and third Psalm, one on Phil. i, 3, *et seqq.*, ("Fellowship in the Gospel,") one on the word χαλκολίβανον, (Rev. i, 15; ii, 18,) and finally the first of a series of "Historical Contributions to the Exegesis of the New Testament" ("On the Family of Herod in the New Testament"). The last-named is a long (58 pp.) and valuable article, which covers the whole ground of the connection of this family with the origin of Christianity. In addition to the above there is a criticism of Prof. Dr. Dorner's recent philosophical construction of the idea of God, and an ill-tempered review of the last General Synod in Baden, together with a long series of literary notices and criticisms, occupying nearly a hundred pages.

2.—*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1868. *Viertes Heft.*

The above number of the "Year-books" for German theology contains four principal articles. The first is one of a series on "The Eschatological Doctrines, and their Importance in Systematic Theology and in Ecclesiastical Life," by Diakonus Schmidt. In the present number the writer gives a history, in epitome, of Eschatology, embracing: I. The Ancient Church down to Tertullian and Irenæus; II. The Græco-Latin Church down to the beginning of the Middle Age; III. The Middle Age; IV. The Period of the Reformation; V. From the Rise of Pietism down to Schleiermacher. Prof. Dr. Wieseler furnishes a learned discussion of the character, contents, and origin of the Jewish Apocryphal writing, ἀνάληψις Μοϋσέως, a Latin translation of which was recently discovered in the Ambrosian Library in Milan. Dr. Steitz closes his very long series of articles on "The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Greek Church," and Prof. Lipsius discusses at length Tertullian's book "*adversus Praxean.*" The present number of this able periodical is exceedingly valuable.

3.—*Der Katholik. Zeitschrift für Katholische Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben.* 1868. *November.*

There are only two articles worthy of special mention. The first is an attempt to whitewash the so-called Pope Liberius (who, in the year 357, renounced the communion of Athanasius that he might be allowed to return from banishment) clean from heresy. It is a piece of readable sophistry and special pleading. The second is the first part of an article on the "Blood-phials of the Catacombs." It is well known that the Catacombs of Rome were used by the Christians as places of refuge and of worship in times of persecution. They were, however, used more particularly as burial places

for the dead. Here the remains of the martyrs found their final rest; and, after the persecutions ceased, it was considered by all Christians, but especially by the rich and aristocratic, a great privilege to be buried there, so that their remains might be sanctified by local contact with the ashes of so many who had died a violent death in the cause of Christ. In consequence of the convulsions caused by the irruption of the barbarians, the Catacombs gradually ceased to be visited, and finally the very fact of their existence was forgotten. In the latter half of the sixteenth century they were rediscovered, and, naturally, became at once a center of interest for all Christians. They were, of course, objects of especial interest to the Roman Church. Antonio Bosio was the Columbus who opened this new world of gold to the Mother Church. The discovery was as important to the *trade* of the Church as was the discovery of America to the commerce of the world. What cart-loads, what whole ship-loads of "relics" these Catacombs contained! But how were the remains of the martyrs to be distinguished from those of ordinary Christians? After some vacillation, it was finally decided that those niches contained relics of martyrs, which were designated by a *palm* or furnished with a "blood-phial," a vessel containing a red fluid. This decision, given by the *Congregatio Rituum et Reliquiarum*, April 10, 1668, has never been satisfactory even to all Catholic scholars. Between the years 1855–63, the subject was discussed *pro et contra* with great acrimony, until it was thought time to put an end to it. Pius IX appointed a special commission to investigate the matter, and (although it had been proved, that if all the relics marked by the presence of the "blood-phial" were assumed to be those of martyrs, the number of martyrs would be greater than the whole number of Christians in Rome!) it was decided that the decree of 1668 must be sustained. The writer of the above-mentioned article undertakes to prove by *scientific investigation* that both decisions were right.

4.—*Revue Chrétienne. Paris.*

This valuable monthly, edited by M. de Pressensé, the Church historian and author of the Life of Christ, promises a series of valuable contributions for the current year. There will be two articles by M. Ernest Naville, (author of "The Heavenly Father," recently translated,) on the "Adversaries of Philosophy;" an article by M. Charles Waddington, on "Philosophy and Religion;" one by M. Mazelet, on the "Origin of Evil;" one by M. Bonifas, on the "Religious Value of the Christian Doctrines;" a study by M. Godet, on the "Revelation of St. John;" two studies by M. de Pressensé, on the "Protestant Crisis in France," and on "The State of Catholicism on the Eve of the Council of 1869;" together with a large number of other articles on important topics.

5.—*The British Quarterly Review.* 1869. *January.*

Among the various interesting articles in this number of the "*British Quarterly*" is a trenchant review of Dr. Davidson's new "Introduction to the Study of the New Testament." Acknowledging the learning of the author as "great in every department of Biblical study," the reviewer disagrees with him *in toto.* In the concluding paragraph he says: "Our best wish, therefore, with respect to the learned, but, as we think, grievously mistaken, writer from whom we now part, is that he may not make a single convert to his opinions." Two able articles on "Church Principles and Prospects," and on "The New Parliament and Mr. Gladstone," discuss the present ecclesiastical situation in England.

6.—*The London Quarterly Review.* 1869. *January.*

"The Mythical and Heretical Gospels" is the title of an important contribution in the current number of the above magazine. It is based on the works of Tischendorf and Nicolas, and furnishes, in compact form, a great deal of information on the subject treated. There is also an able and readable article on "Tertullian," giving an account of the writings of this eminent father of the Church. Also, an article deserving of careful reading is the one on "Philosophy and Positivism." The spirit of it is indicated by the closing paragraph:

"Since all men, conscious of a spiritual nature within them, must have a religion, will the disciples of M. Comte insult our reason, by asking that we give up the *Bible,* and put the *Positivists' Catechism* in its place? Will they mock the most sacred necessities of our nature by demanding that we substitute the '*Religion of Humanity*' for the *Religion of Christ?*"

7.—*The British and Foreign Evangelical Review.* 1869. *January.*

Contributions worthy of especial notice are: "Irenæus," "The Civil Magistrate," "Spain in its Relation to the Reformation," and "The Exegetical Punctuation of the New Testament." The first of these articles gives a well-digested summary of the opinions of Irenæus, showing, at a glance, the importance of his testimony in questions relating to the Gospel history and to the original Constitution of the Church. The second of the above-mentioned articles is an important contribution to the discussion now going on in England respecting the "disestablishment of the Church."

8.—*The Contemporary Review.* 1869. *January.*

The "*Contemporary*" is one of the spiciest of the English reviews, and always contains matter worthy of perusal. Its articles are never heavy; they are always "popular," in the best sense of that word. The current number contains an article by Dr. Hannah, entitled, "One word more on the Clergy and Science." It has been preceded by others on the same topic, (Sept., 1867, and Dec., 1868,) by Dr. Hannah and Mr. Farrar.

EDITORS' ROUND TABLE.

THE OLD YEAR AND ITS LESSONS.—It is the duty of the Christian to carefully study passing events. To know the times in which one lives, is knowledge of the greatest importance. And especially is it important to know the times in which *we* live. The present age is one of the most remarkable that has ever dawned upon the world's history. Hence, we may reasonably expect that each year, as it passes away, will be crowded with deeply interesting historic events.

The year 1868 has passed into the tomb of the ages, and it is now our duty to study its history, and appropriate its lessons. In Europe, the great absorbing events of the year were the Revolution in Spain, the Reform Movement in England, and the new interest manifested by the governments of Europe in the Cretan Insurrection. These movements all have a profound religious significance. Religious liberty is already vouchsafed in Spain under the new government, and that long-degraded and priest-ridden people have now an opportunity to become free. The Bible will soon be found in every household throughout that land, and this, of itself, will insure the people against a return to spiritual bondage.

And should the Liberal Party in England make good their present prospects, the disunion of Church and State there is only a question of time. There is a far deeper interest involved in this controversy than is seen in simply the Irish Church question. The *status* of the Anglican Church is likewise involved; and the moment the Irish Church question is decided in favor of the Liberal Party, the people throughout the whole of England will be virtually free from the payment of taxes to support a clerical aristocracy in the Established Church. And though the disestablishment of that Church may not take place directly, it can not be delayed for any great length of time. Surely does the world move.

The Cretan revolution is not of so much consequence in itself as in the complications to which it is likely to lead. We can not see clearly the end of this difficulty, but we confidently believe that good will come out of it for the cause of both religious and civil liberty. A pure Christianity can never make much headway in Europe until there is a re-adjustment or re-organization of the governments there. Hence, all these political changes point to a day, not far distant, when the people will have full liberty to study the

Word of God for themselves. When that day shall come, the reign of despots, in both Church and State, will have ended.

Many signs in our own country indicate a more prosperous condition of the Church. The year that has just passed was marked by great restlessness in religious society. Evidently the old systems are tottering on their rotten foundations. Men are rapidly losing faith in human creeds, and are seeking an interest in Him who is the "same yesterday, to-day, and forever." In other words, the people are more disposed to take Christ as their leader, to trust in him as the "Chief among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely," than ever before. There is, also, a willingness upon the part of the people to take the Word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and to throw aside all the commandments and traditions of men. These are cheering indications, and should encourage all the friends of truth to renew their efforts in restoring Christianity to its primitive purity and simplicity. Let the year 1869 be full of good fruits in this glorious work.

How Does the Matter now Stand?—The "Evangelical Ministerial Association of Cincinnati," at its regular meeting in December, adopted a Constitution requiring all ministers in good-standing in their respective denominations to subscribe a specified "doctrinal statement," as a condition of membership in the Association. Pending the motion for adoption of the Constitution, it was asked if said "doctrinal statement" was intended to be a *test*, and if all who refused to subscribe it were to be considered no longer members of the Association. To this it was replied that it was not a test, and that no one was required to subscribe it. The "doctrinal statement" passed, and the Association adjourned. Now, the question is, which is right, the Constitution, which requires that the "statement of doctrines" be subscribed, or the view entertained by a large majority of the Association? As the doings of this Association are likely to become historical, this question ought to be settled. How does the matter stand?

How do You Like It?—We send this number of the *Quarterly* to a few of our friends who have not yet subscribed for it, but who, we feel sure, will do so, when they see the kind of Magazine we are publishing. Please send in your names and money at once. Our prospects are very encouraging, and if those who feel the need of such a work will give us their influence, the success of the *Quarterly* will soon be a fixed fact.

Who Writes for the Quarterly?—It will be seen that the names of the writers in the *Quarterly* do not appear in connection with their respective articles. We prefer that every thing shall stand on its *real* merits, and hence the names will not be given till the last number of the year, when due credit will be made to every one, in the index.

THE

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1869.

I.—GALILEO AND THE CHURCH.*

FOR nearly three hundred years the vast majority of the English race have regarded the name of the Roman Church as the synonym of immorality, intolerance, and oppression. Wherever this race was found, for most of that long period, her cause was considered so hopeless that little effort was made to put it on a better footing. But a generation ago a movement was inaugurated in England and in America looking to her rehabilitation, characterized by zeal, ability, and scholarship. This movement has, day by day, become more formidable, so that now there is, in every center of population, a herald proclaiming to English-speaking men that they are entirely mistaken. Every count in the Protestant indictment is denied with fervor and dogmatic positiveness; and by none more fervidly and positively than by the conductor of *The Catholic World.* In recent issues of this magazine appeared two remarkable articles, bearing the caption "Galileo Galilei, The Florentine Astronomer," written in defense of the Church, and in detraction of the Florentine philosopher. The intelligent Protestant reader at once recognizes these articles as a contribution to the exculpatory Catholic literature in which the period is so rife. As the writer charges Protestants with dealing unjustly with the Church in this old controversy, as he boldly

* Articles on *Galileo Galilei, the Florentine Astronomer*, in *The Catholic World*, for December, 1868, and January, 1869.

denies that the Church persecuted science in the person of Galileo, and as he detracts from the high estimate in which the world has long held him, we have thought it fitting to go over the whole subject as thoroughly as the facilities at our command would permit. We have accumulated some rich literary materials not accessible to the common reader, and these we propose to elaborate into a full historical sketch of Galileo's controversy with the Church. In this we hope to do justice to the Holy See, to Galileo, and thereby to our readers.

At an early period in our investigation one fact struck us forcibly: The anxiety of Catholic apologists to relieve the Holy See of the odium it brought upon itself by its treatment of Galileo. Frequent and learned attempts to do this have been made during the last generation. In the year 1838, an article appeared in *The Dublin Review*—a publication established by Cardinal Wiseman contemporaneously with the *renaissance* of Romanism in England—which is certified by good Catholic authority as giving "the best statement of the case which, up to that period, had ever been presented to English readers." This article, for some time incorrectly attributed to Wiseman himself, was republished in Cincinnati, with an American preface, in 1844. We have been unable to obtain this document, but it is not probable that it contains valuable matter not found in later publications. In 1858, M. Biot, an eminent French scientist and a pious Catholic, made a defense, in four articles contributed to the *Journal des Savants*. To M. Biot's peculiar line of argument we shall have occasion to refer hereafter. It does not appear that American pens have been laid under contribution until *The Catholic World* gave us its two articles in December and January. As the writer of these articles is a man of ability, learning, and literary skill, as he has said every thing important that can be said on the Church side of the subject, and especially as he writes for the American public, we shall pay particular attention to what he has written, though we shall not write controversially farther than the nature of the questions discussed and the demands of the occasion seem to require.

The thoughtful reader of the articles in *The Catholic World* will first note the *élan* with which they are written—that assured confidence which not unfrequently leads to victory. The writer first tells

the story in this exaggerated form: "Generally speaking, English and American boys emerge from their college reading with an idea, more or less vague, that the moment Galileo announced the doctrine of the earth's rotation he was seized upon by the Inquisition, cast into prison, tortured in various ways, until all his bones were broken; that he pretended to recant, but, with broken bones aforesaid, stood up erect, stamped his foot, and thundered out '*E pur si muove*' (and yet it moves).'" This wretched caricature is characterized as "the wretched play that so long has had a sort of historic Black Crook run," which is "now about to be swept away with other old rubbish," when "the curtain will fall, never again to rise." *The Catholic World* further says: "We wish at once to present the Galileo story as truly told; for soon there will be nothing left of it to discuss, and the moving drama of

'The starry Galileo, with his woes,'

will cease to be played to crowded and delighted anti-Catholic audiences." Now, we do not hesitate to say that the opinions commonly held by Protestants touching this controversy need some rectification; neither do we hesitate to say that, when all due rectification is made, the skirts of the Roman Church are not cleared. But to our task.

Astronomy is the oldest of the sciences. As long ago as the time when Abraham herded his cattle and folded his sheep on Chaldean plains, men had some knowledge of the stars. Those who made the first careful observation of the heavens were not poets and philosophers; they were sailors, farmers, and shepherds. The early names applied to celestial phenomena signify as much. The Moon was called the Measurer—the measurer of time; "For time," says a great authority, "was measured by nights, and moons, and winters, long before it was reckoned by days, and suns, and years." The Greek sailor's "sailing stars" were the *Pleiades;* and the name is from *plein,* to sail. The early Latins were farmers, as the early Greeks were sailors. They called the *Pleiades Virgiliae,* from *virga,* a sprout or twig, because these stars became visible in Italy at the opening of the summer. Having made this rude beginning, astronomy passed from the hand of the sailor and the farmer, who sought in it only immediate uses, to the hand of the poet and the

philosopher. The latter cultivated it with assiduity, and, considering his disadvantages, with great success. Some of the earliest Greek philosophers had remarkably correct ideas of the form and motions of the heavenly bodies. Thus, Pythagoras, that great man belonging to the sixth century, B. C.—a name so shadowy as to be almost mythical—taught that the earth was round, that it revolved around the sun, and that it was small compared with other of the heavenly bodies. Pythagoras was probably the author of the heliocentric astronomy. Accordingly, when such theologians as Turrettine, in the seventeenth century, sought to bring the heliocentric theory into disrepute, they said it had a Pagan origin, and called it that "false Pythagorean doctrine." But, strange to say, fuller knowledge led to error. The Alexandrian astronomers were far better informed than any that had gone before them—far better than any of their contemporaries; and yet, from the schools of Alexandria, in the second century of our era, went forth an astronomical theory bearing the great name of Ptolemy, false to nature, and yet a theory that was almost universally received for fifteen hundred years.

The Middle Ages afford an excellent illustration of the way in which the very name of a great man sometimes comes to hang like an incubus upon the world, narrowing the mind, stifling inquiry, preventing progress; perhaps the whole history of the human mind affords no better. We refer to the dreadful tyranny of Aristotle throughout that long and dark period. The philosophers of those ages were his followers; that is, they clung to Aristotelian names, methods, and forms; but so far from being Aristotelian in spirit, they did not so much as divine what that spirit was. Now, it had so happened, that the Aristotelians had taken the Ptolemaic astronomy under their patronage; the fortunes of the philosophy and the astronomy were bound up together. There was no future for the mind of Europe until the fetters with which the Stagirite had bound it should be broken. Copernicus and Galileo, Kepler and Luther, Bacon and Newton were the champions of intellectual liberty, who broke these fetters and let the soul go free. Further, it is noteworthy that there is evermore a close alliance between theology and philosophy; and this because theology is but philosophy applied to religion. This is a capital fact in the case before us. The Church of the Middle Ages was Aristotelian; those learned pedants, the school-men, spent

their lives in adjusting the relations of Christianity to the philosophy taught by Aristotle in the Lyceum three and a half centuries before the giving of the Gospel. The theologian, the Aristotelian, and the Ptolemaist formed a triple league too formidable to be trifled with. Now, with these facts before us, knowing what we do of human nature, of the ecclesiastical spirit, of the genius of the Papacy, and of the moral and intellectual condition of Europe at the opening of the Modern Era, what could we expect other than that the man would meet with opposition who, in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, should treat the prevailing philosophy with defiance?—an opposition that would become persecution when that defiance involved theological dogmas? This *a priori* view is completely borne out by the facts.

The time came at length when the power of this triple alliance should be broken. Remembering that in the sixteenth century Europe and the Church were synonymous, it is apparent that the iconoclasts must come from among the Church's own children. Nicholas Copernicus struck the first stalwart blow—a blow to be repeated until the chains imposed by superstition, dogmatic faith, and an antiquated philosophy should fall from the mind of Europe. Copernicus was a devout Catholic, and a priest. He was the nephew and protégé of the Bishop of Ermeland; he consented to the publication of his *De Revolutionibus* only after much urging by Cardinal Schomberg, who also defrayed the expense; he dedicated it to the Pope, while the Bishop of Culm superintended the printing. The bearing of these facts upon the question at issue will be considered hereafter.

The Catholic World attempts to prove that in the two generations intervening between Copernicus and Galileo, the heliocentric astronomy made considerable headway. The object is twofold: 1. To show that the men who held and taught the doctrine during that period were not molested by the Church; and 2. As a consequence that Galileo must have been responsible for the treatment he received in 1616. But, with all its diligence, it can gather only a dozen names, and, with one or two exceptions, these are so obscure that even well-read men have no knowledge of them. Touching the status of the Copernican astronomy, at the time when Galileo became its most distinguished champion, we quote from the calm

and dispassionate Hallam, to whom Macaulay paid the highest compliment when he said he wrote history like a judge, and not like an advocate:

"It can excite no wonder that the system of Copernicus, simple and beautiful as it is, met with little encouragement for a long time after its promulgation, when we reflect upon the natural obstacles to its reception. Mankind can, in general, take these theories of the celestial movements only upon trust from philosophers; and in this instance it required a very general concurrence of competent judges to overcome the repugnance of what called itself common sense, and was, in fact, a prejudice as natural, as universal, and as irresistible as could influence human belief. With this was united another, derived from the language of Scripture; and, though it might have been sufficient to answer, that phrases implying the rest of the Earth and motion of the Sun are merely popular, and such as those who are best convinced of the opposite doctrine must employ in ordinary language, this was neither satisfactory to the vulgar, nor recognized by the Church. Nor were the astronomers, in general, much more favorable to the new theory than either the clergy or the multitude. They had taken pains to familiarize their understandings with the Ptolemaic hypothesis; and it may be often observed that those who have once mastered a complex theory are better pleased with it than with one of more simplicity. The whole weight of Aristotle's name, which, in the sixteenth century, not only biased the judgment, but engaged the passions, connected, as it was, with general orthodoxy and preservation of established systems, was thrown into the scale against Copernicus."*

That could not have been an age of much astronomical knowledge, or, indeed, of much scientific attainment of any sort, when Francesco Sizzi was accounted an eminent astronomer. This man, a townsman and contemporary of Galileo, was a Professor of Padua. To prove that Jupiter had no satellites he reasoned thus:

"There are seven windows given to animals in the domicile of the head, through which the air is admitted to the tabernacle of the body, to enlighten, to warm, and nourish it; which windows are the principal parts of the microcosm or little world, two nostrils, two eyes, two ears, and one mouth; so in the heavens, as in a macrocosm or great world, there are two favorable stars, Jupiter and Venus; two unpropitious, Mars and Saturn; two luminaries, the Sun and Moon, and Mercury alone undecided and indifferent. From which, and many other phenomena of nature, such as the seven metals, etc., which it were too tedious to enumerate, *we gather the number of planets is necessarily seven.* Moreover, the satellites are invisible to the naked eye, and, therefore, can exercise no influence upon the earth; and, therefore, would be useless; and, therefore, do not exist. Besides, as well the Jews and other ancient nations, as modern Europeans, have adopted the divisions of the week into seven days, and have named them from the seven planets; now, if we increase the number of planets, this whole system falls to the ground."

*"Introduction to the Literature of Europe," Harper's edition, vol. I, p. 395.

Having thus paved the way, we are ready to introduce the great Florentine upon the stage.

Galileo Galilei was born in Pisa, February 28, 1564. He was intended for the medical profession by his father, who did his utmost to repress the young man's longing for mathematical studies. But his bent of nature was too decided to be overcome, and, finally, the father yielded his own wishes to his son's persistence. It was in the Cathedral of his native city that he discovered, in his eighteenth year, the isochronism of the vibrations of the pendulum; as it was from the top of its Leaning Tower that he subsequently performed the experiments which refuted the cherished Aristotelian notion touching the velocity of falling bodies. In his twenty-fourth year Galileo was appointed to a professorship of mathematics in the University of Pisa. Having drawn down upon himself the enmity of the Aristotelians, he was glad to resign this position, which he did in 1592, accepting the chair of mathematics at Padua. Here he remained until 1610, when he went to Florence. During all this time he followed, with the greatest ardor, the bent of his genius. It is not known at what time he embraced the Copernican doctrine; but there is positive testimony to prove that, aggressive and intrepid as was his spirit, he for some time hesitated to avow his faith, for fear of the consequences such avowal was likely to bring upon him. This testimony is afforded by a letter written by Galileo to Kepler in 1597. We give a portion of this letter which bears directly upon the issues raised in the present discussion. After acknowledging the receipt of Kepler's *Mysterium Cosmographicum*, he continues:*

"I have as yet read nothing beyond the preface of your book, from which, however, I catch a glimpse of your meaning, and feel great joy in meeting so powerful an associate in the pursuit of truth, and consequently such a friend of truth itself; for it is deplorable that there should be so few who care about truth, and who do not persist in their perverse mode of philosophizing. But as this is not a fit time for lamenting the melancholy condition of our times, but for congratulating you on your elegant discoveries in confirmation of the truth, I shall only add a promise to peruse your book dispassionately, and with a conviction that I shall find in it much to admire. I shall do this the more willingly, because, many years ago, I became a convert to the opinions of Copernicus, and by that theory have fully succeeded in explaining many phenomena, which, on the contrary hypothesis, are

* It is interesting to know that these two great philosophers, living in the midst of an intellectual waste, cheered each other by a correspondence, continued to the close of Kepler's life, in 1630.

altogether inexplicable. I have arranged many arguments and confutations of the opposite opinions, which, however, I have not yet dared to publish, *fearing the fate of our master Copernicus*, who, although he has earned immortal fame among a few, yet by an infinite number (for so only is the number of fools to be measured) is denounced and derided. If there were more such as you I would venture to publish my speculations, but since this is not so, I shall take time to consider it."

Galileo does not appear to have openly taught the heliocentric astronomy previous to the year 1604. After that time he is its most powerful champion. Being temporarily in Venice, in 1609, he heard that a Hollander had invented an instrument by which distant objects were made to appear near at hand. His mind quickly acted upon this hint, and he speedily produced a telescope, first, one that magnified three times; then a larger one, that magnified eight times; and, finally, one still larger, that magnified thirty-three times. With the latter instrument, "a baby telescope," as *The Catholic World* calls it, a mere leaden organ-pipe, thirty inches in length, with two small lenses, he made the most surprising discoveries. He resolved some of the nebulæ in the milky way, saw the mountains in the moon, discovered the forty stars in the Pleiades and the four satellites of Jupiter. When he announced these discoveries in his *Nuncius Sidereus*, published in March, 1610, he created the most profound sensation. The few scattered disciples of Copernicus heard with astonishment and delight; the hosts who followed the name of Aristotle and Ptolemy listened with astonishment, but with incredulity and with rage. With his thirty-inch organ-pipe, armed with two small lenses, the philosopher had dashed the Ptolemaic astronomy to atoms; the great Florentine had won for himself immortal honors, and, at the same time, made himself obnoxious to persecution. There was nothing left for the Ptolemaists but to deny the correctness of the astronomer's observations, to cover his discoveries with ridicule, and himself with insult. When Galileo offered to give them ocular demonstrations, some refused to look through his glass. It was at this time Sizzi delivered himself of the amazing utterances quoted above; also, that Caccini, a Dominican monk, preached the famous sermon, in which he quoted the words, "*Ye men of Galileo, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?*" a sermon in which he attacked Galileo personally, denounced mathematics as a diabolical art, and declared that the mathematicians, as the authors of every heresy, should be

banished from every Christian land.* A young German, Martin Horky, declared, "I will never concede his four new planets to that Italian, though I die for it"—an utterance, in which he stated, in the tersest language, the spirit of the old astronomers. Galileo held on his way, replying to men like Sizzi, "that although their arguments might have force in inducing us to believe beforehand that no more than seven planets existed, they were hardly sufficient to annihilate those new ones which were actually seen to exist." But he wrote to Kepler: "O, my beloved Kepler, how I wish that we could have one laugh together! Here, at Padua, is the principal professor of philosophy, whom I have repeatedly and urgently requested to look at the moon and planets through my telescope, which he pertinaciously refuses to do. Why, my dear Kepler, are you not here? What shouts of laughter we should have at all this solemn folly! and figure the professor of Pisa laboring before the Grand Duke with logical arguments, as if with magical incantations, to charm the new planets out of the sky!" Flushed with his great discoveries, and with his momentary triumph over his enemies, Galileo could well afford to write in such a strain; but the time was drawing near when the controversy should become a serious business, and not at all a laughing matter.

The great astronomer was now at the zenith of his popularity. He received a large salary from the State; and from nobles and princes testimonials of their esteem and admiration. He had wealth, reputation, and honors. It is due to Rome to say, that when he visited that city, in 1611, he was treated in a manner corresponding to his talents and learning. He set up his best telescope in the garden of Cardinal Bandini, and, for weeks, gave an opportunity for all who chose to behold the wonders of the upper deep. Returning to Florence, he became involved in a philosophical controversy, and wrote learnedly upon hydrostatics. But, before hastening on to his decline and fall, we must state *The World's* explanation of Galileo's condemnation in 1616.

We have already stated the relations of Copernicus to the Church and to the hierarchy. *The Catholic World* says: "The Copernican

* *The Catholic World* lays some stress upon the fact that the Chief of the Dominican Order rebuked Caccini for this sermon. It does not so much as mention the fact that he was soon after promoted to a higher position.

theory was, so to speak, born, cradled, nurtured, and developed in the Church, and under the very shadow of St. Peter's." Undoubtedly, the Church is entitled to such credit as the facts give her; but it is proper to remind those writers who say the Church, as a Church, has never persecuted, but only individuals—who say the seven Cardinals who passed sentence upon Galileo did not speak for the Church, but only for the Inquisition—that the course of the three or four enlightened ecclesiastics who patronized Copernicus, does not prove that the Catholic spirit, in the sixteenth century, was favorable to scientific inquiry. Catholic writers are now very anxious to have it understood that Copernicus was a priest. How was it in 1616, when the Holy Office, with consent of the Pope, put his immortal work on the *Index Expurgatorius?* After insisting that Copernicus was the child of the Church, and that he was patronized rather than persecuted—after parading its dozen disciples of Copernicus, who lived unmolested, in the two generations following, *The World* says: "And yet we now reach a period when a professor of this same Copernican theory, in its home in Italy, was to be submitted to what are called the terrors of the Inquisition! Whence the change? How came it about?" To assume that there was, in any proper sense, a "change"—a change in the temper or spirit of the Roman hierarchy—is to assume the point in controversy, is to assume what the facts do not sustain. But it will be demanded of us, Why, then, did the Church not persecute Copernicus? To which we reply, first of all: that great man died within a few hours after the first copy of his published work was placed in his hands. But, it will be said, this is no sufficient answer, since Copernicus had held the theory undisturbed during the last forty years of his life. This difficulty is easily resolved when we study carefully the character of the two men, and the circumstances under which they advocated the heliocentric doctrine. Copernicus held the doctrine in retirement, living in a small Polish village; he withheld his book from publication long after his convictions were fully matured. The Cardinal Shomberg succeeded in getting the manuscript for the press, only after long and urgent entreaty; and when the work did finally appear, the preface clearly showed the fate the philosopher anticipated for it. To what conclusion do these facts point? To this, unmistakably: Nicholas Copernicus was a retiring scholar—a man of no

aggressive force—a champion not likely in such an age, or in any age, to give offense to Church or State. Even *The National Quarterly*, a semi-Roman publication, says: "Copernicus was one of those gentle souls who shrank from creating any commotion." Galileo Galilei was a very different sort of man. His was a strong, a vaulting, an aggressive mind. He was not the man long to hold a sleeping truth; but the man to make the world ring with its advocacy. And then he lived in Italy, the home of the Pope, a center whence light could be radiated throughout Europe. The early history of the Protestant Reformation furnishes a complete parallel. It is not likely that the Roman Church would have paid much attention to Philip Melancthon, the elegant but timorous scholar, sitting in his study writing anti-Popish books; but Martin Luther, the bold preacher, thundering the same doctrines from his pulpit in Wittenburg, into the ears of the German people, this was a different thing. Now, Nicholas Copernicus and Galileo Galilei were respectively the Melancthon and the Luther of the new astronomy. The one observing the stars from the garret of his two-story house in Frauenburgh, and writing an immortal work in his study, which for thirty-six years he shrank from publishing, was a very different character from the other, lecturing and writing books in the great city of Florence.

But how do the Catholic apologists account for the change? Here they all have one answer. *The Catholic World* continues its questions: "Were there elements in the controversy other than scientific? And was it the fault of Galileo that the question was shifted from the safe repose of the scientific basis in which it had remained undisturbed more than fourscore years?" Both of these questions are answered in the affirmative. The writer in *The Catholic World* boldly says—and in this the other apologists agree with him—"Galileo was proceeded against by the Inquisition, not because he taught the Copernican astronomy, but because he attempted to defend it by making citations from the Scriptures." Says our writer: "In vain Bellarmine cautioned him—'It was essential that he should confine himself within his mathematical studies, if he wished to secure tranquillity for his labors.' In vain Cardinal Barberini gave him the same advice. 'Prove your system! Demonstrate it!' they substantially say to Galileo; 'and give yourself no concern about the Scriptures! The theologians will take care of them.'" Many Protestants

will be unable to see any pertinence in such an answer as this. Let us say then, once for all, 1. That the Catholic Church does not suffer a layman to expound the Scriptures—and Galileo was a layman; 2. That it does not allow any man to teach an interpretation contrary to that held by the Church. Granting that the answer made by the Catholic apologist is the true one, (a question we shall soon examine,) it is either satisfactory or worthless; it either exculpates the Church, or sinks it beneath the weight of a heavier condemnation. All depends upon the point of view occupied by him who passes judgment. The submissive Catholic will say, If Galileo contravened the canons of the Church, in either of the particulars named, he must suffer the consequences. The thinking Protestant will say, While it is a gross crime against humanity to punish a man for seeing that among the stars which Ptolemy did not see, it is a crime still grosser to punish him for expounding the Word of God. This is a line of argument we shall not follow. We simply say, if this position can be maintained, then the guilt of the Holy See in the controversy with Galileo is simply shifted to another ground. We shall now state all the material facts bearing upon the question.

As we have seen, the adherents of the old astronomy, who were the vast majority, were determined the new should not prevail if they could, by any means, prevent it. Their opposition was constant, strenuous, and virulent;* but they had the discernment to see that the only effectual power to array against Galileo was that of the Church. Excuse the Church as Catholic apologists may, on the ground of Galileo's violence and rashness, the fact remains, that the Church was willing to be used. Accordingly the outcries of the Ptolemaists were reëchoed by the priests. The astronomers said it was a sin to scoop out valleys in the fair face of the moon. The

* The men, whose habit it is to charge theologians with opposition to science, should note the fact that it was the philosophers who led the crusade upon Galileo. *The National Quarterly*, in an article on Copernicus, says: "Copernicus was aware, that, old as the Church was, even in his time, philosophers had been persecuted before it existed. He knew it was not the Church that had persecuted Socrates, and finally put him to death, but the populace. He was aware that it was not the Church that placed the life of Anaxagoras in jeopardy for having asserted that the moon was considerably larger, small as it looked in the heavens, than the whole of the Peloponnesus, and that if its centrifugal force ceased for a moment, it would fall to the earth like a stone from a sling." Such facts as these, too, teach a lesson.

ministers of religion said it was impious to send the world whirling through the regions of space. Both alike cried out (and apparently with equal violence) that the heliocentric doctrine was disproved by the Bible. Catholic apologists will have it that Galileo was condemned because he insisted on bringing the Scriptures into the controversy. Now, we bid the reader note a fact which these gentlemen do not tell us. *The enemies of Galileo were the first to make this appeal;* only when it had been bruited throughout Italy that his opinions were contrary to religion, did the astronomer reply. He wrote several letters, in the years 1613–14–15, upon the religious phase of the subject, in which he insisted, first and last, that the Scriptures ought not to be quoted to decide questions of experience and observation. From one of these letters, that addressed to the Grand Duchess of Tuscany, in 1615, we quote the following noble passages:

"I am inclined to believe that the intention of the Sacred Scriptures is to give mankind the information necessary for their salvation, and which, surpassing all human knowledge, can by no other means be accredited than by the mouth of the Holy Spirit. But I do not hold it necessary to believe that the same God who hath endowed us with sense, with speech, and with intellect, intended that we should neglect the use of these, and seek by other means the knowledge which they are sufficient to procure us; especially in a science like astronomy, of which so little notice is taken in the Scriptures, that none of the planets, except the sun and moon, and once or twice only, Venus, under the name of Lucifer, are so much as mentioned there. This, therefore, being granted, I think that in the discussion of natural problems, we ought not to begin at the authority of texts of Scripture, but at sensible experiments and necessary demonstrations; for from the Divine Word, Sacred Scripture and nature did both alike proceed; and I conceive, that, concerning natural effects, that which either sensible experience sets before our eyes, or necessary demonstrations prove unto us, ought not, upon any account, to be called in question, much less condemned, upon the testimony of Scripture texts, which may, under their words, couch senses seemingly contrary thereto. . . . Again, to command the professors of Astronomy, that they, of themselves, should see to the confuting of their observations and demonstrations, is to enjoin a thing beyond all possibility of being done; for it is not only to command them not to see that which they do see, and not to understand that which they do understand, but it is to order them to look for, and find, the contrary of that which they happen to meet with. I would entreat these wise and prudent fathers that they would, with all diligence, consider the difference which exists between opinionated and demonstrated doctrine, to the end that, well weighing in their own minds with what force necessary inferences urge us, they might the better assure themselves that it is not in the power of professors of demonstrative sciences to change their opinions at pleasure, and adopt first one side and then another; and there is a

great difference between commanding a mathematician or philosopher, and the disposing of a lawyer or a merchant; and that the demonstrative conclusions touching the things of nature and of the heavens can not be changed with the same facility as the opinions of what is lawful or not, in a contract, bargain, or bill of exchange. Therefore, first let these men apply themselves to examine the arguments of Copernicus and others, and leave the condemning of them as erroneous and heretical, to whomever it belongs; yet let them not hope to find such rash and precipitate demonstrations in the judicious and holy fathers, or in the absolute wisdom of Him who can not err, as those into which they suffer themselves to be hurried by some particular interest or affection of their own. In these, and such other positions, which are not directly articles of faith, no man doubts but his Holiness has always an absolute power of admitting or condemning them; *but it is not in the power of any creature to make them to be true or false, otherwise than of their own nature and in fact they are.*"

This reasoning was unanswerable. Perhaps it was unwise in Galileo not to permit the matter to rest here. But, while he insisted thus strenuously that the Holy Word was not the arbiter in questions of science, he yet thought it proper, since his enemies had made the appeal, to show that his opinions did not antagonize with religion. In this he simply did what every logician does, who, denying the legitimacy of a given line of argument, yet undertakes to show that it would not sustain the conclusion, even if it were legitimate. Accordingly, in this letter to the Grand Duchess, as well as in others of the same kind, Galileo "undertook to prove theologically, and by reasons deduced from the Fathers, that the terms of Scripture might be reconciled with his new discoveries respecting the construction of the universe." For the first time Galileo now laid himself open to attack. Neither Church nor State had legislated against a man's studying or teaching astronomy; but the Church had legislated against a layman expounding the Scriptures, or against any one placing a construction upon them different from that which the Church received. The great astronomer had laid himself open to both these charges. A Protestant would say, verily, it was hard to prohibit Galileo from answering a word, while ignorant priests were permitted to range through the Bible at will, to find texts with which to confute his doctrine, and to bring him into disrepute; but with a Romanist, governed by the dicta of the Church, rather than by reason, touching such a question as this, it is idle to argue. The enemies of Galileo were swift to improve their advantage. Lorini, a Dominican monk, denounced him to the Inquisition at Rome. Caccini

went to Rome to embody the evidence against him, and also to denounce the great work of Copernicus. Having first obtained the consent of Cosmo, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, in December, 1615, Galileo went to Rome to counteract the machinations of his enemies. When he left that city a few months later, he had, at the bidding of the Inquisition, renounced the Copernican astronomy. Let us see how the thing was done.

At first, Galileo's denunciator was non-suited on a technicality. Cardinal Barberini advised the astronomer "not to travel out of the limits of physics and mathematics, but to confine himself to such reasonings as Ptolemy and Copernicus used; because, declaring the views of Scripture, the theologians maintained to be their particular province." If it were not an idle curiosity, we would like to know whether the Cardinal gave the same advice to the insulting rabble of priests and Ptolemaists who dogged the heels of the great Florentine! But the matter was brought before the Pope and the Cardinals again. This was done by Cardinal Orsini, Galileo's own firm friend, whose object was to obtain from the authorities some recognition of the new astronomy. To say the least, Orsini should have known better. The Pope now declared he would send the matter before the Inquisition. He immediately referred the matter to eleven consulting theologians, who reported February 24, 1616. The pith of this report is found in the following words:

"To maintain that the sun is placed immovably in the center of the world (universe) is an opinion absurd in itself, false in philosophy, and formally heretical, *because it is directly contrary to the Scriptures;* to maintain that the earth is not placed in the center of the world (universe), that it is not immovable, and that it has even a daily motion or rotation, is also an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and, *at least, erroneous in point of faith.*"

The business now proceeded with dispatch. On the 25th of February, by virtue of an order written by the Pope himself, Galileo was summoned the next day to the palace of the Inquisition. On the 26th, he stood in the presence of Cardinal Bellarmine, to hear the final decree of the Holy Office. The events of these two days are thus summed up by Sir David Brewster:

"The Inquisition assembled to consider these charges on the 25th of February, 1616; and it was decreed that Galileo should be enjoined by Cardinal Bellarmine to renounce the obnoxious doctrines, and to pledge himself that he would neither

teach, defend, nor publish them in future. In the event of his refusal to acquiesce in this sentence, it was decreed that he should be thrown into prison. Galileo did not hesitate to yield to this injunction. On the following day, the 26th of February, he appeared before Cardinal Bellarmine to renounce his heretical opinions; and having declared that he abandoned the doctrine of the earth's motion, and would neither defend nor teach it in his conversations or in his writings, he was dismissed from the court."

If we may be permitted to quote a sentence from another article, "this is the pass to which we come when the Church, forgetting her own divinely appointed mission, presumes to pronounce authoritatively on scientific questions."

While it omits some important facts stated in the above extract from Sir David Brewster, *The Catholic World* is yet constrained to say: "Galileo was enjoined by the decree to abandon the opinion of terrestrial motion, and neither to teach nor treat of it." But the Holy Office did not pause here. On the 4th of March the work of Foscarini, a Carmelite friar and professor of philosophy, (an exposition of the heliocentric doctrine,) was condemned, which proves, according to good Catholic authority, that Galileo was not discriminated against "merely because he was a layman." Foscarini's work, Galileo's letters, Kepler's epitome of the Copernican doctrine, and Copernicus's *De Revolutionibus*, were all put in the list of prohibited books.* Catholic writers now plume themselves upon the fact that

* These works were taken from the Index of prohibited books by Pope Benedict XIV in 1835. A vigorous pamphleteer says: "Since that time, I suppose, the Roman Church allows the earth to turn on its axis and to revolve around the sun." We deem it proper to give a brief account of the Congregation of the Index.

The Inquisition, called by Pope Paul IV "the sheet-anchor of the Papacy," took rank, as a regular constituted institution of religion, in 1215—the very year that the great English Charter was granted. St. Dominic was, probably, its originator. At least, it was early put under the control of the Dominican Order. Among its most ingenious and successful inventions for the suppression of free thought must be placed the two Indexes. The *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* is a catalogue of books which the Roman Church absolutely forbids the body of its communicants to read. The *Index Librorum Expurgatorum*, commonly called the *Index Expurgatorius*, is a catalogue of books proscribed until such passages as are obnoxious to the Church are expunged. These Indexes are prepared by eleven cardinals and theologians at Rome, called the Congregation of the Index. Few, even of those well read in history, have little conception of the immense influence this Congregation has exerted. In 1543, the very year in which Copernicus's work was published, Cardinal Caraffa decreed that "no book whatever, whether new or old, and whatever its contents, should for the future be printed without permission from the Inquisition." We shall meet this decree again before we are done with our story. Speaking of the *Index*, Paul Sarpi wrote: "Never will a more effectual means be discovered of making dunces of men under the pretense of making them more pious." Before dismissing this subject we quote two paragraphs from Hallam:

"But Rome struck a fatal blow, and perhaps more deadly than she intended, at literature

the father of the received system of astronomy was a Catholic and a priest; let them not forget that, in 1616, the high authorities at Rome set upon his great work the seal of condemnation.

Interrupting here the course of our narrative, we have several questions to propound: If the intention was to punish Galileo simply for meddling with the Scriptures, why did not the Inquisition so state in express terms in its decree? Why did it not content itself with condemning Galileo in that wherein he had offended? Why did the eleven consulting theologians pronounce the proposition that the earth revolves "absurd," "false in philosophy, and, at least, erroneous in point of faith?" Why did the Holy Office enjoin Galileo "to renounce the obnoxious doctrines, and to pledge himself that he would neither teach, defend, nor publish them in future?" Why did it resolve to throw him into prison unless he should make such a pledge? Why did it interdict the epitome of Kepler? and, above all, the great work of the beloved priest, Copernicus? While we are not in the habit of dealing in defiance, we do here, on this broad page,

in the *Index Expurgatorius* of prohibited books. It had long been the regulation that no book should be printed without a previous license. This was, of course, a restraint on the freedom of writing, but it was less injurious to the trade of the printer and book-seller than the subsequent prohibition of what he had published or purchased at his own cost or risk. The first list of books prohibited by the Church was set forth by Paul IV, in 1559. His Index included all Bibles in modern languages, enumerating forty-eight editions, chiefly printed in countries still within the obedience of the Church. Sixty-one printers are put under a general ban, all works of every description from their presses being forbidden. Stephens and Oporinus have the honor of being among these. This system was pursued and rigorously acted upon by the successors of the imperious Caraffa. The Council of Trent had its own list of condemned publications. Philip II has been said to have preceded the Pope himself in a similar proscription. Wherever the sway of Rome and Spain was felt, books were unsparingly burned, and to this cause is imputed the scarcity of many editions.

"In its principle, which was apparently that of preserving obedience, the prohibitory system might seem to have left untouched many great walks of learning and science. It is, of course, manifest that it fell with but an oblique blow upon common literature. Yet, as a few words or sentences were sufficient to elicit a sentence of condemnation, often issued with little reflection, it was difficult for any author to be fully secure; and this inspired so much apprehension into printers, that they became unwilling to incur hazard of an obnoxious trade. These occupations, says Galluzzi, which had begun to prosper at Florence, never recovered the wound inflicted by the severe regulations of Paul IV and Pius V. The art retired to Switzerland and Germany. The book-sellers were at the mercy of the Inquisition, which every day contrived new methods of harassing them. From an interdiction of the sale of certain prohibited books, the Church proceeded to forbid that of all which were not expressly permitted. The Guinti, a firm not so eminent as it had been in the early part of the century, but still the honor of Florence, remonstrated in vain. It seems probable, however, that after the death of Pius V. the most rigorous and bigoted Pontiff that ever filled the chair, some degree of relaxation took place."—*Harper's edition*, vol. I, p. 413.

challenge any and all Catholics, from Rome to the uttermost parts of the earth, to answer these questions in any way that shall save their beloved hypothesis; which hypothesis, we do not hesitate to say, is made to order—wholly an afterthought, an attempt at whitewashing; an hypothesis that is really more discreditable to the Roman Church than the crime with which she has so long stood charged. The real intention of the Church was, at the time, perfectly well understood. We quote again from Hallam:

"The Church was not mistaken in supposing that she should intimidate the Copernicans, but very much so in expecting to suppress the theory. Descartes was so astonished at hearing of the sentence on Galileo, that he was almost disposed to burn his papers, or, at least, to let no one see them. 'I can not collect,' he says, 'that he who is an Italian, and friend of the Pope, as I understand, has been criminated on any other account than for having attempted to establish the motion of the earth. I know that this opinion was formerly censured by some cardinals; but I thought I had since heard that no objection was now made to its being publicly taught even at Rome.' It seems not at all unlikely that Descartes was induced, on this account, to pretend to a greater degree of difference from Copernicus than he really felt, and even to deny, in a certain sense of his own, the obnoxious tenet of the earth's motion. He was not without danger of a sentence against truth nearer at hand—Cardinal Richelieu having had the intention of procuring a decree of the Sorbonne to the same effect, which, by the good sense of some of that society, fell to the ground."*

Hallam does not make it entirely clear whether Descartes wrote of the decree of 1616 or that of 1633. Probably it was the latter; but does not matter so far as its value, touching the question at issue, is concerned. Blaise Pascal, a most pious Catholic, as well as a miracle of genius, belongs to the next generation. He did not hesitate to charge the condemnation of Galileo upon the Jesuits. In the eighteenth Provincial Letter, dated March 24, 1657, he wrote these stinging words:

"It was to equally little purpose that you obtain against Galileo a decree from Rome, condemning his opinion respecting the motion of the earth. It will never be proved by such an argument as this that the earth remains stationary; and if it can be demonstrated, by sound observation, that it is the earth and not the sun that revolves, the efforts and arguments of all mankind put together will not hinder our planet from revolving, nor themselves from revolving with her."

When all was over, Galileo had an audience with the Pope, who received him very graciously, and gave him every assurance of good-will

* "Literature of Europe." Harper's edition, vol. II, p. 249.

and friendship. What had been done at Rome was not generally understood in other than a general way. The enemies of Galileo circulated the report that the Congregation of the Index had condemned him, and that he had abjured his opinions. That the astronomer might be able to refute these calumnies, on the 26th of May, Cardinal Bellarmine gave him a writing setting forth that a "communication was made to him of a declaration of His Holiness," "from the tenor of which it results, that 'the doctrine attributed to Copernicus, as to the pretended movement of the earth around the sun, and as to the place which the sun occupies in the center of the world, without moving from its rising to its setting, is opposed to the Holy Scriptures, and, consequently, may not be defended or held.'" With the delivery of this document, the first act of "the moving drama" closes, and the curtain falls. Before the curtain again rises, we have a remark to make touching the position and the conduct of Cardinal Bellarmine. *The Catholic World* states that there is the most "overwhelming testimony, that he never questioned the *truth* of Galileo's doctrine, but only his imprudent manner of propounding it." We know nothing of this testimony; but this we do know, if there is such testimony, then the grand Cardinal was guilty of the grossest self-stultification. He "never questioned the truth of Galileo's doctrine," and yet he was the Pope's mouth-piece in declaring that this doctrine "is opposed to the Holy Scriptures, and, consequently, may not be defended or held." Unless the *World* has done him the greatest injustice, the Commissary of the Holy Office was guilty of "holding," what, according to the decree of his own tribunal, might not be "held," because opposed to the Holy Scriptures!

Returning to Florence, Galileo gave himself, with his usual ardor, to scientific studies. In 1618 his health failed. He wrote several philosophical works, but, as they add nothing to his fame, and do not bear upon the question we are now chiefly interested in, we shall not so much as give their titles. In 1623 Cardinal Barberini was elected Pope. Henceforth we shall know him as Urban VIII. His election was hailed by scientific men with enthusiasm. We are told that Galileo hailed it with exultation. He had opposed the decree of 1616, and had subsequently treated Galileo with much kindness. He immediately wrote a letter to the Grand Duke of

Tuscany, felicitating him on the glory redounding to Etruria, by reason of the philosopher's genius and discoveries. But the *man Barberini* was soon swallowed up in the *Pope Urban.*

In 1624 Galileo made a third visit to Rome. According to his own story, he was kindly received. He had six audiences with the Pope, who treated him with great consideration. He was the recipient of many presents; among others, a pension of one hundred crowns yearly, while another of sixty crowns was promised his son. But he was not long learning, however, that the Church had no intention of revoking its decree. The current of feeling at Rome was, that the facts of science should not be so stated as to militate against the Scriptures. The more intelligent ecclesiastics were, evidently, desirous of avoiding troublesome complications. An extract of a letter written by Galileo on the 8th of June, shows this: "With regard to deciding on what side the truth lies, Father Mostro adheres neither to the Copernican nor the Ptolemaic system, but satisfies himself with a system of his own, which is a very convenient one; it is, that angels, who trouble nobody, move the stars as they like, and that we have nothing further to see in them." A "convenient" system, surely!

As the Catholic apologists lay much stress on the fact that, on different occasions, Galileo was treated with great kindness by the authorities at Rome, we must give it some attention. What does the fact determine as to the position of the Pope and his advisers, with reference to the new astronomy? Since the eleven consulting theologians had pronounced Galileo's doctrine false, absurd, and heretical; since the Congregation of the Index, at the bidding of Paul V, had declared that doctrine "opposed to the Holy Scriptures"—a doctrine that might not be "defended" or "held"—and had exacted from Galileo a promise that he would wholly abandon it; and, since it was in the power of the Inquisition to enforce this decree by pains and penalties; in view of all these unquestioned facts, we fail to see that the granting of an audience, in which said Paul V gave the philosopher assurance of good-will and friendship, is a very material consideration. What astonishes us in this transaction is, not that the Pope was willing to grant, but that Galileo was willing to accept, an audience. A man of loftiest soul, under such circumstances, would have refused to listen to the Pope's assurance. The

only excuse that we can frame for him is this: Galileo was a Catholic. From his birth he had breathed the air of Italy, poisoned with political and religious servility. His fault was the fault of the age, or rather of that type of religion which invests a man with the divine attributes. The transaction of 1624 must be viewed somewhat differently. Urban had not dictated the decree of 1616, but, as a cardinal, had opposed it; personally he was Galileo's friend. To accept his gifts was less degrading than to accept Paul's assurances. But Galileo would now appear to vastly better advantage on the historic page, if, asserting a manly independence, he had refused them.

But Galileo's manhood, we grieve to say, rests under still more damaging imputations. There is, however, another point of view, from which these Pontifical courtesies may be considered. The functionaries at Rome were anxious to have Galileo keep quiet. The public mind was becoming unsettled with reference to the patristic astronomy. Galileo wielded a power that the hierarchy feared. The hierarchy was strong, the philosopher weak; the hierarchy could crush the philosopher at any moment, but the philosopher, if he became exasperated, might do infinite mischief. Like Sampson, he might triumph in his death. Mother Church is quite like some other mothers, who brandish the rod with one hand, and hold out confectionery in the other. Accordingly, Galileo was punished and pensioned. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that, in 1633, Urban felt personally aggrieved at Galileo's course. He impliedly charged him with ingratitude, saying: "Signor Galileo has been my friend; we have several times conversed familiarly together, and ate at the same table."

We may well suppose that Galileo continually chafed under the restraints laid upon him. He is said to have had "connection with a political party, unfriendly to religion as well as to the Papal government"—a party called, by *The North British Review*, "the band of skeptics that hounded him on to his ruin." Sad fact, that the foremost man of science that graced the age should have been driven, by the ignorant illiberality of the Church, to affiliate with skeptics! Although the astronomer was constantly restive, he did not, until half a generation had passed, violate his parole. But violate it at length he did, and the violation, its antecedents and

consequents, is the second act of the "moving drama." Again the curtain rises.

So early as 1630, Galileo had completed a work, entitled "The System of the World of Galileo Galilei," in which he undertook to demonstrate, not openly and directly, but covertly and hypothetically, the Copernican system. This work consisted of four dialogues concerning the two principal systems of the world. *The North British Review* describes it thus:

"It is dedicated to his patron, Ferdinand, Grand Duke of Tuscany, and is prefaced by an 'Address to the Prudent Reader,' which is itself any thing but prudent. He refers to the decree of the Inquisition in the most insulting and ironical language. By insinuations ascribed to others, he attributes the decree to ignorance and to passion; and he pretends to demonstrate the Copernican system purely as a mathematical hypothesis, and not as an opinion absolutely more sound than that of Ptolemy. Of the three persons by whom the dialogue is carried on, Salviati is the true philosopher and principal speaker in the dialogue. Sagredo, the name of another friend of the author, proposes doubts, suggests difficulties, and enlivens with his wit the gravity of the dialogue. Simplicio, a stanch Peripatetic and follower of Ptolemy, modestly pleads the cause of the Ptolemaic system, but is baffled on every point by the philosophy and wit of his friends."

It was easy for Galileo to write such a book as this, but to publish it was a more difficult matter. According to the standing rule of the Inquisition, no book could be published in Italy (at least not in some of the States, and Tuscany was one of these) without a permission from the functionary known at Rome as the Master of the Sacred Palace, who acted as censor of new publications. Fortunately, or unfortunately, this functionary had been a pupil of Galileo. License to print was finally obtained, but the manner in which it was obtained, to say the least, raises the question whether the astronomer acted in good faith. In 1632 the work was published at Florence. Those mathematicians and astronomers who were not hopelessly wedded to the old system, received it with loud acclaims, but the exploding of a powder magazine under the Vatican could not have created a more profound sensation at Rome. The Inquisition promptly prohibited the circulation of the copies that had been sent to Rome, and the opinion universally prevailed that the daring author would be summarily punished; and so, in time, he was. Pausing here, in our narrative, we must pay some attention to one or two subordinate questions.

To account for the publication of this work has occasioned much

perplexity. Did Galileo imagine that the Church had forgotten the decree of 1616? Did he imagine that the Inquisition slept? Did he suppose that it would suffer him to brave its authority? Had the gifts of Urban led him to the conclusion that there had been a change in the Pontifical policy? It is impossible to find satisfactory answers to these questions. If Galileo answered them affirmatively, he most certainly counted without his host. Sir David Brewster seeks to account for the publication by supposing, that, notwithstanding that Galileo "made a narrow escape from the grasp of the Inquisition, he was never sufficiently sensible of the lenity which he experienced;" that is to say, the philosopher did not appreciate the gravity of the occasion. We should rather seek to solve the problem, though with much diffidence, by supposing that the volcanic forces of a nature that had been most cruelly outraged by bigoted philosophers and ignorant priests, could no longer be repressed. But whatever hypothesis may be resorted to, it is impossible to defend Galileo. If he had maintained a sturdy independence, then he would have been free to speak or to keep silent; that were a question between him and God. But he had promised neither to defend nor to hold the Copernican system; besides, he had hopelessly compromised himself by accepting the donatives of Urban. He was under bonds to keep the peace. But we must remember that other great men, both before and since, have been guilty of similar weakness and folly. Galileo's sad fate should serve as a warning to others. He who intends to defy high political or ecclesiastical functionaries should take heed how he becomes a pensioner upon their bounty. Nor does Galileo seem to have been wholly straightforward in obtaining the license from the censor. That officer did not attend to his business very thoroughly, and it is not certain that the philosopher acted in bad faith. In either case it is well to remember that oppressive legislation is not calculated to develop straightforwardness. Either political or ecclesiastical inquisitors drive even good men into indiscretions and moral obliquities for which the moral sense of mankind refuses to hold them responsible. According to the laws of Great Britain, John Hancock was a smuggler.

Whatever may have been Galileo's thoughts previous to the publication of his dialogues, they were no sooner published than he saw himself in the face of imminent danger. He implored the

protection of the Grand Duke, who did his utmost to shield him. Attempts were made to propitiate the Pope, but his Holiness insisted that the majesty of the law must be vindicated. In the month of September, 1632, Galileo was cited to repair to Rome and present himself to the Commissary of the Holy Office. He was now nearly seventy years old, and very infirm. When the Tuscan embassador pleaded those facts, as a reason why the citation should not be enforced, the Pope said: "Let him come slowly, in a litter, and quite at his ease, but it is absolutely necessary that he should be examined in person, and may God forgive him for having got into such difficulties, after I, when Cardinal, had, on a former occasion, extricated him." On the 13th of February, 1633, the great Florentine arrived in Rome, and was lodged in the house of the Tuscan embassador.

The principal count in the indictment against Galileo was, that he had broken the decree of 1616. The story of the trial is a long one, and we have neither the space nor the disposition to recount it in detail. The official records have never yet been fully published in any modern language. If the extracts that have come to our knowledge do justice to the whole, and, still further, if the official records do justice to the truth, then Galileo did not appear to good advantage before the Inquisition. He was not the man of lofty independence, of commanding manhood, that we have loved to picture him; but he was the man of broken, timorous spirit, who resorted to quibbles and apparent equivocation. At length the trial ended, and a sentence was framed. On the 21st of June, Galileo was summoned to the Holy Office, where he was kept over the following day. On the 23d he was taken to the Church of Minerva, where the decree was read to him, and where, on his knees, clothed in a penitential garment, in the presence of the cardinals and the prelates of the Congregation of the Index, he abjured that beautiful system of astronomy of which he continues to be one of the greatest expounders. The decree of the Congregation is a lengthy document, but as it is rare, and as it corroborates our view of the trial of 1616, we give it entire. Here it follows, as copied from the broad page of the *Encyclopædia Brittanica:*

"We, the undersigned, by the grace of God, Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, Inquisitors General throughout the whole Christian Republic, Special Deputies of the Holy Apostolical Chair against heretical Depravity: Whereas,

you, Galileo, son of the late Vincenzo Galilei, of Florence, aged seventy years, were denounced, in 1615, to this Holy Office, for holding as true a false doctrine taught by many, namely, that the sun is immovable in the center of the world, and that the earth moves, and also with a diurnal motion; also, for having pupils whom you instructed in the same opinions; also, for maintaining a correspondence on the same with some German mathematicians; also, for publishing certain letters on the solar spots, in which you developed the same doctrine as true; also, for answering the objections which were continually produced from the Holy Scriptures, by glozing the said Scriptures according to your own meaning; and, whereas, thereupon was produced the copy of a writing, in form of a letter, professedly written by you to a person, formerly your pupil, in which, following the hypothesis of Copernicus, you include several propositions contrary to the true sense and authority of the Holy Scriptures; therefore, this holy tribunal, being desirous of providing against the disorder and mischief which was thence proceeding and increasing, to the detriment of the holy faith, by the desire of His Holiness, and the most eminent Lords Cardinals of this supreme and universal Inquisition, the two propositions of the stability of the sun, and motion of the earth, were *qualified* by the *theological qualifiers* as follows: 1. *The proposition that the sun is in the center of the world, and immovable from its place, is absurd, philosophically false, and formally heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the Holy Scripture.* 2. *The proposition that the earth is not the center of the world, nor immovable, but that it moves, and also with a diurnal motion, is also absurd, philosophically false, and, theologically considered, at least erroneous in faith.* But, whereas, being pleased at that time to deal mildly with you, it was decreed in the holy *Congregation*, held before His Holiness on the 25th day of February, 1616, that his eminence, the Lord Cardinal Bellarmine, should enjoin you to give up altogether the said false doctrine; if you should refuse, that you should be ordered by the Commissary of the Holy Office to relinquish it, not to teach it to others, nor to defend it, nor ever mention it, and in default of acquiescence that you should be imprisoned; and, in execution of this decree, on the following day, at the palace, in presence of his eminence, the said Lord Cardinal Bellarmine, after you had been mildly admonished by the said Lord Cardinal, you were commanded by the acting Commissary of the Holy Office, before a notary and witnesses, to relinquish altogether the said false opinion, and in future neither to defend nor teach it in any manner, neither verbally nor in writing; and, upon your promising obedience, you were dismissed. And in order that so pernicious a doctrine might be altogether rooted out, nor insinuate itself further to the heavy detriment of the Catholic truth, a decree emanated from the holy Congregation of the Index prohibiting the books which treat of this doctrine; and it was declared false, and altogether contrary to the Holy and Divine Scripture. And, whereas, a book has since appeared, published at Florence, last year, the title of which showed that you were the author, which title is, *The Dialogue of Galileo Galilei, on the two principal systems of the world, the Ptolemaic and Copernican;* and, whereas, the holy Congregation has heard that, in consequence of the printing of the said book, the false opinion of the earth's motion and stability of the sun is daily gaining ground, the said book has been taken into careful consideration, and in it has been detected a glaring violation of the said order, which had been intimated to you; inasmuch as in this book you have defended the said opinion, already and in your presence condemned; although in the said book you

labor with many circumlocutions to induce the belief that it is left by you undecided, and in express terms probable; which is equally a very grave error, since an opinion can in no way be probable which has been already declared, and finally determined contrary to the Divine Scripture. Therefore, by our order, you have been cited to this Holy Office, where, on your examination upon oath, you have acknowledged the said book as written and printed by you. You also confessed that you began to write the said book ten or twelve years ago, after the order aforesaid had been given; also, that you demanded license to publish it, but without signifying to those who granted you this permission, that you had been commanded not to hold, defend, or teach the said doctrine in any manner. You also confess that the style of the said book was, in many places, so composed that the reader might think the arguments adduced on the false side, to be so worded as more effectually to entangle the understanding, than to be easily solved; alleging, in excuse, that you have thus run into an error, foreign (as you say) to your intention, from writing in the form of a dialogue, and in consequence of the natural complacency which every one feels with regard to his own subtilties, and in showing himself more skillful than the generality of mankind, in contriving, even in favor of false propositions, ingenious and apparently probable arguments; and, upon a convenient time being given to you for making your defense, you produced a certificate in the handwriting of his eminence, the Lord Cardinal Bellarmine, procured, as you said, by yourself, that you might defend yourself against the calumnies of your enemies, who reported that you had abjured your opiniôns, and had been punished by the Holy Office; in which certificate it is declared that you had not abjured, nor had been punished, but merely that the declaration made by His Holiness, and promulgated by the holy Congregation of the Index, had been announced to you, which declares that the opinion of the motion of the earth and stability of the sun, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and, therefore, can not be held or defended. Wherefore, since no mention is there made of two articles of the order, to-wit, the order 'not to teach,' and 'in any manner,' you argue that we ought to believe that, in the lapse of fourteen or sixteen years, they had escaped your memory, and that this was also the reason why you were silent as to the order when you sought permission to publish your book, and that this is said by you not to excuse your error, but that it may be attributed to vainglorious ambition, rather than to malice. But this very certificate, produced on your behalf, has greatly aggravated your offense, since it is therein declared that the said opinion was contrary to the Holy Scriptures; and yet you have dared to treat of it, to defend it, and to argue that it is probable, nor is there any extenuation in the license artfully and cunningly extorted by you, since you did not intimate the command imposed upon you; but, whereas, it appeared to us that you had not disclosed the whole truth with regard to your intentions, we thought it necessary to proceed to the rigorous examination of you, in which (without any prejudice to what you had confessed, and which is above detailed against you, with regard to your said intention) you answered like a good Catholic. Therefore, having seen and maturely considered the merits of your cause, with your said confessions and excuses, and every thing else which ought to be seen and considered, we have come to the under-written final sentence against you. Invoking, therefore, the most holy name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his most glorious Virgin Mother Mary, by this our final sentence, which, sitting in council and judgment for the Tribunal of the Reverend Masters of Sacred Theology,

and Doctors of both Laws, our assessors, we put forth in this writing, touching the matters and controversies before us, between the magnificent Charles Sincerus, Doctor of both Laws, Fiscal Proctor of this Holy Office, of the one part, and you, Galileo Galilei, an examined and confessed criminal from this present writing now in progress as above, of the other part; we pronounce, judge, and declare, that you, the said Galileo, by reason of these things which have been detailed in the course of this writing, and which, as above, you have confessed, have rendered yourself vehemently suspected by this Holy Office of heresy, that is to say, that you believe and hold the false doctrine, and contrary to the Holy and Divine Scriptures, namely: that the sun is the center of the world, and that it does not move from east to west, and that the earth does not move, and is not the center of the world; also, that an opinion can be held and supported as probable after it has been declared and finally decreed contrary to the Holy Scripture, and, consequently, that you have incurred all the censures and penalties enjoined and promulgated in the sacred canons, and other general and particular constitutions against delinquents of this description; from which it is our pleasure that you be absolved, provided that, first, with a sincere heart and unfeigned faith, in our presence, you abjure, curse, and detest the said errors and heresies, and every other error and heresy contrary to the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Rome, in the form now shown to you. But, that your grievous and pernicious error and transgression may not go altogether unpunished, and that you may be made more cautious in future, and may be a warning to others to abstain from delinquencies of this sort, we decree that the book of the Dialogues of Galileo Galilei be prohibited by a public edict, and we condemn you to the formal prison of this Holy Office, for a period determinable at our pleasure, and, by way of salutary penance, we order you, during the next three years, to recite once a week the seven penitential psalms, reserving to ourselves the power of moderating, commuting, or taking off the whole or part of the said punishment and penance. And so we say, pronounce, and by our sentence decree, and reserve, in this and in every other better form and manner, which lawfully we may and can use. So we, the subscribing Cardinals, pronounce.

FELIX, CARDINAL DI ASCOLI, GUIDO, CARDINAL BENTIVOGLIO,
DESIDERIO, CARDINAL DI CREMONA, ANTONIA, CARDINAL S. ONOFRIO,
BERLINGERO, CARDINAL GESSI, FABRICIO, CARDINAL VEROSPI,
MARTINO, CARDINAL GINETTI."

This decree, of itself, disposes of the plea that Galileo was punished as a theologian and not as an astronomer. *The Catholic World* finds it an onerous task to harmonize it with its theory. After quoting some of the more obnoxious portions, it says: "Let the advocates of the old version of the Galileo story make the most of it;" words that are evidently prompted by its despair, and not by its confidence.

Some of the claims made by Catholic apologists must be allowed: 1. Considering the fact that Galileo was a prisoner of the Inquisition, he was treated with great lenity by the authorities at Rome;

2. He was not tortured, as was formally held—the expression "*esame rogorosa*," or "rigorous examination," found in the decree, being susceptible of another meaning; 3. The astronomer did not say as he rose from his knees, "It moves though;" 4. The Pope immediately commuted the sentence of imprisonment. But these further facts are also indisputable: 1. Galileo would have been treated with much greater severity had it not been for the persistent intercession of the Grand Duke of Tuscany in his behalf;* 2. The sentence of imprisonment was never revoked, so that he might, at any time, be immured in a dungeon without further trial; 3. To the day of his death the philosopher was kept in limited confinement, sometimes in his own house; 4. His friends at Florence and Rome were treated with the most insulting indignities. We shall have occasion to speak of other evidences of malignity, when we come to the close of this great and checkered career.

The time has now come to pay some attention to the four articles contributed by M. Biot to the *Journal des Savants*. The length of this article precludes a very full consideration of the peculiar theory set forth in them. Happily, such consideration is not necessary.

M. Biot states, that being in Rome, in 1825, he had an interview with the Commissary of the Holy Office, (the personage commonly known as the Grand Inquisitor,) who told him that Galileo was tried and condemned in 1633, because he had ridiculed the Pope in his dialogues. The charge was, that the peripatetic "Simplicio" was no less a personage than Urban VIII. This was an old story, but new to M. Biot, who seems to have believed it most implicitly. After waiting thirty-three years, he published it to the world. It is used by all the apologists whom we have consulted.

Now, we confess, that when we first saw this theory put forth by good Catholics, we were greatly amazed. His Holiness, the Pope, crushing a defenseless astronomer on account of a personal grievance, and at the same time telling the world that he did it for an entirely different reason! In a Protestant this would have been called a slander. As we read we found ourselves groping for the long-forgotten words of Virgil: "*Tantaene animis coelestibus irae?*"

* Urban himself said to the Tuscan embassador that, out of respect to this sovereign, he had treated the philosopher with "unusual gentleness and clemency in permitting him to remain at the embassy, instead of transferring him to the Inquisition."

"Is there so great anger in celestial minds?" The theory itself has been repeatedly exploded. *The North British Review* effectually disposed of it in an article entitled "The Martyrdom of Galileo," published in November, 1860. The writer conclusively showed: 1. That Simplicio was not Urban; 2. That Urban could not have felt aggrieved even if he had furnished the original of that character; 3. That no other theory is necessary to explain the Pope's action than the one which lies on the very surface, namely: Galileo had defied ecclesiastical authority, and that authority must be vindicated by punishing him. M. Biot's theory, which is also resorted to by the *World*, merits at our hands no further consideration.

The Catholic World has introduced another question into the discussion. It affirms that Galileo did not demonstrate the Copernican system—that that system was not susceptible of demonstration in his age. These are its words:

> "If Galileo did determine the problem of the moving of the earth, *there is no excuse for Rome!* But, a candid examination of the condition of astronomical science at that period, and of the extent of Galileo's acquisitions, will show that not only was the system not demonstrated by Galileo, but that, with the entire fund of astronomical and physical knowledge in his day, it was not then susceptible of demonstration by him or by any one else. . . . Only the combined genius and ceaseless toil of the illustrious men of science of all Christendom barely succeeded in accomplishing the demonstration of which we speak, nearly two centuries after the grave had closed over Galileo and his judges."

To omit to state these facts is styled leaving "totally out of view one capital feature" of the discussion. Now, we are quite at a loss to imagine what discoveries were made at the time referred to, that settled the question of the earth's rotation. We opine that it would puzzle our men of science to name them. But, the *World* subsequently modifies its dictum, and says the system is not established yet! Now, we freely admit that Galileo's scientific attainments are a proper subject of investigation, but we fail to see their relevancy to the main question. The point of the argument is, that the Congregation of the Index did not sin against light and knowledge in condemning Galileo, because he had not proved his doctrine. The reader must note the admission that "if Galileo determined the problem of the movement of the earth, *there is no excuse for Rome.*" This implies that as he did *not* determine that problem, Rome is excusable. But it would appear to one who simply follows the

leadings of common sense, that if the Florentine had a right to determine it, he had a right to attempt to determine it, and if the Church is "without excuse" for dragging him before the Inquisition provided he succeeded, it is also without excuse provided he partially failed. The right to succeed involves the right to fail. Reduced to its simplest form, the *World's* thesis is this: the Church may lay violent hands on the philosopher who sets up a scientific doctrine in opposition to her interpretation of the Bible, provided he fails to establish it; but if he establish it, then she may not touch him. Then it would appear to the man of simple common sense that, if the Church had the right to interfere with Galileo for meddling with the Scriptures in the one case, she had equally the same right in the other. The truth is, she had no right in either; but the soundness or unsoundness of a scientific doctrine can not be allowed to interfere with the question of authority. If the astronomers had all lived in Italy, and if they had all withheld their speculation until they were able to demonstrate the heliocentric astronomy to the satisfaction of the Inquisition, the mass of Christians would be Ptolemaists still.

But *The Catholic World* is not content to defend its own communion against the charge of persecuting science; it seeks to turn the tables upon Protestants. Tycho Brahe was persecuted in Denmark, Kepler and Descartes in Holland, both Protestant countries. Other of the high priests of science have been persecuted by Protestants. These charges are all true, and he who does not admit them has no right to accuse Rome. We fail to see that, when the merits of the two astronomics were being canvassed in the seventeenth century, Protestants were more pervious to the light than Romanists. The ecclesiastical spirit is not Christ's spirit. In the Christian system, God is the God of Truth; Christ is the Truth; men are made "free" by the Truth; the Comforter is the Spirit of Truth; the disciple is of the Truth. Dogmatic systems are something very different. The simple theologian or ecclesiastic lives in a close atmosphere; his thoughts are upon dogmas and ecclesiastical regulations; he is not liberalized by a large knowledge of men and of the world; he knows little of those invigorating studies that lead to largeness of view. Here the difference between the average Catholic doctor and the average Protestant doctor is one of degree merely. The system of the former has much more of dogma and ecclesiasticism, and he is,

accordingly, much less liberal, much less tolerant. The Protestant principle is favorable to freedom of thought; but there are too many Protestants whose spirit and temper are such as the repressive Roman system nourishes. It was as inexcusable in the Calvinists to burn Servetus for denying the doctrine of the Trinity, as it was in the Catholics to burn Bruno for denying the doctrine of Transubstantiation; as inexcusable in the Hollanders to molest Kepler, as in the Italians to persecute Galileo. God forbid that we should excuse a Protestant when we would condemn a Catholic! But we can not shut our eyes to the different tendencies of the two systems; besides, it is worth remarking, that modern judges are frequently unjust to these ancient sinners. Their faults were commonly the faults of the age in which they lived. It was the sixteenth century that burned Servetus, rather than Calvin and his co-religionists. In this foul deed we see what humanity was capable of in an age when the conception of what Roger Williams called "soul freedom" had not dawned upon the human mind. Gladly would we throw the same mantle over the crimes committed by the Roman Church if we had opportunity; but the dogma of infallibility intervenes, and compels us to hold those who committed them responsible.

Let us not be misunderstood. We understand the best Catholic authorities to hold theoretically the dogma of infallibility thus: *The concurrent voice of the Church, expressed by Council and by Pope conjointly, is infallible.* Hence, it may be argued, that as the Church concurrently did not condemn Galileo, therefore, the Church is not responsible. But to what does the dogma practically lead? A whole is equal to the sum of its parts. Fallible individuals can not form an infallible Council or an infallible Church. Hence, if a logical mind holds a body of men infallible, it will practically regard the individuals who compose it as not liable to error. Accordingly, those Catholics who desire the next Council to declare the Pope's personal infallibility are good logicians. If the Catholic faithful regard the voice of the Council as the voice of God, they must hold the Pope and the Bishop, and, therefore, the priests, out of whom Popes and Bishops are made, as above criticism. The tendency of Catholic teaching and discipline is well understood. There is a "divinity that doth hedge" a priest; and this to such a degree that it seems to be morally impossible for a good Catholic to tell the whole truth,

provided his Church is to be compromised thereby. If the time ever comes when the Catholic laity look upon a priest as they look upon another man, then the abandonment of the dogma of Church infallibility will not be very remote.

The cases of Servetus and Kepler, of Bruno and Galileo, then, stand on very different footings. The crimes against the former were committed by weak and sinning men; those against the latter by the spiritually illuminated Pope and Cardinals of an infallible Church. In the one case the intelligent Protestant condemns; in the other the most liberal and intelligent Catholics excuse and defend.

Yet once more: *The Catholic World* says, granting the decree of the Inquisition to have been all that is claimed, it was, after all, nothing but a decree of the Inquisition. And again: "The Inquisition forms no permanent or essential part of the organization of the Catholic Church." The Inquisition has existed for six hundred and fifty years, and unless it is soon abolished, we fear it will become "permanent." The Pope, who seems to have regarded it "essential," called it the "sheet-anchor of the Church." But the Pope is both a "permanent" and "essential part of the Church." Now, Paul V dictated the decree of 1616, and Urban VIII approved, if he did not dictate, that of 1633—facts that should make the *World* ashamed of its wretched quibble.

To return to Galileo: He survived his condemnation nine years, retaining his vigor of mind to the last. When he became blind he said, "So it pleases God, and shall, therefore, please me also." The displeasure of the Church followed him to the end. He died in 1642, the prisoner of the Inquisition. He was forbidden to make a will. His body was denied Christian burial, and for a century it lay in a dishonored grave. His friends provided a monument to his memory, but the Pope forbade its erection. His fame was left to posterity, and well has it been vindicated. History has a brilliant page for his discoveries; and the man of large mind and heart has sympathy for him in his sorrows, and charity for him in his errors. Throughout the better ages that are to come, the story of

"The starry Galileo, with his woes,"

will still be told as one of high achievement and human frailty on the one hand, of dense ignorance and brutal intolerance on the other.

II.—PHASES OF RELIGION IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE American people are on the eve of the solution of a great problem. The problem is very complex. The greatest minds are working at it. The grand absorbing question is the *Identification of the Church of Christ.* The theological struggle of the age is opening between those who are simply working toward sectarian ascendency, and those who are determined, at almost any sacrifice, save the sacrifice of principle, to restore the Ancient Order of things, as proclaimed by the inspired Apostles. Numerically, the pleaders for ecclesiasticism possess the vantage-ground; but in moral force they are losing ground every day. Evidently, the master minds of the age feel, and with quickened pulsation, that the solution of the vexed question of Church identification or sectarian consolidation will result, either in plunging the American people still deeper into the waves of sectarian confusion, or in planting them on a platform where honest men can see eye to eye, and love as brethren of one common Lord.

There are no less than four great leading parties engaged in this theological tournament: Rationalists, Roman Catholics, Protestant Sectarians, and Christians.

Rationalists are simply negative men—their philosophy (if they have one) is a negation. They affirm nothing, and deny all. They construct nothing, but pull down every thing. Their policy is that of disorganizing, and by that means producing confusion and doubts. It seems to be their business to classify contradictions; to laugh at the calamities of sectarian system builders; to mock at the poorly performed piety of blind zealots; to glut themselves on the moral putridity of shameless hypocrites. In a word, they see nothing spiritually beautiful, morally sublime, or intellectually transcendent in the religion of Christ. The god of this world is their god. Nothing would please them better than the dethronement of Christ. A dismembered Church would be the height of their delight. If the Church should go to ruin, they would be the first to pick up the spoils.

The boast of the Roman Catholic Church is her *Unity.* If this Church were founded on Christ, and not on Peter; if she were actuated by the love of principle, and not by priestly policy; if Christ stood first, and the Pope stood nowhere; if the Bible should be adopted, and tradition be rejected; if the Church of Rome would lay aside assumed infallibility, and submit to the simple teaching of the Holy Scriptures; if all these should transpire, then, among an enlightened people, and in this age of wonderful mental activity and religious agitation, she might overwhelm all parties by her resistless power. In the present distracted condition of the religious world, if wisely watching the tide of affairs, the Papal power might perform a *coup d'état* that would result in a complete discomfiture of Protestant sectarianism, and, to the astonishment of the world, produce the grand consummation of apostolic Christian unity. Paradoxical as such a proposition may seem, and impracticable as every one might conceive it to be, the full accomplishment of such a moral revolution, in our humble estimation, could be more hopefully anticipated than the consolidation of the antagonistic parties of the Protestant world. But whatever, in a general sense, the Pope's secret designs may be, of one thing we may be certain, so far as the United States are involved, that, with an eager and sleepless eye, he watches the perplexities and contortions of his Protestant antagonists. He evidently understands, what few Protestants apprehend, that Protestant divisions, and therefore Protestant failures, mean Papal unity and Papal prosperity. But with all the advantages of Protestant division on the side of the Papacy, the powers of Popery in the United States, as in Europe, are in perplexity. The apparent, if not real, instability of the Papal See in Rome, as well as the revolutions in Italy, have had much to do, no doubt, in guiding the policy of the Papal powers here, and in causing them to put their prudential measures in such a form as to meet the exigencies of the times and "the Church." The late positive and pointed refusals of the bishops of the Anglican Church, and of the patriarch of the Greek Church, to accept the glowing invitation of the Pope of Rome, to be present at the forthcoming Ecumenical Council, to be held next autumn on the classic banks of the Tiber, where it is proposed to determine the destinies of the Church, have now, and shall have, much to do in shaping the policy of the priests in America, and in molding the public mind

to endure or reject the impostures of the self-styled Sovereign Pontiff.

But the said old gentleman is full of intrigue, and his art of *finesse* is, apparently, inexhaustible. While in Europe public sentiment is rapidly turning in favor of the dissolution of Church and State, and in favor of Church independency, here, in America, as a *dernier ressort*, the Papal authorities are most persistently advocating the startling doctrine, that *the public school funds should be devoted to schools under the immediate supervision of the various religious sects.* And in order to consummate this end, they not only use their own journals in its advocacy, but they even subsidize whatever conscienceless literary magazines they can lay hold of, that, with more efficiency, they may be enabled to accomplish their foul purposes. But this bold attempt at making Churches dependent on State patronage will, no doubt, at once be met by a proud and defiant people—and by those who can not, when the test comes, permit the tread of such an innovation—many thousands of which people, now American citizens, were only too glad to have once escaped the very despotism with which they are now threatened. The humiliation of Pius IX in the Old World is deeply felt in the New World. It is manifest that Pius understands the signs of the times. He does not now thunder his anathemas from the porch of the Vatican, nor offer insults and indignities to people and governments, as did his illustrious predecessors, Gregory VII and Innocent III, several hundred years ago. Our present Pope is becoming very temperate in his zeal, very mild and suave in his spiritual manners, and extremely complaisant to all political governments. This same fawning, beseeching spirit is evidenced in the low tricks and cunning diplomacy of his servile subjects in America. To show that the Romanists are greatly alarmed, and to give the reader an idea of the *status* of the Catholic Church in America, we quote from the *Universe*, one of their own popular journals, published in Philadelphia:

"It is, *perhaps*, quite legitimate to boast with snug self-satisfaction of the growth of the Church in America. But, for our part, we doubt it. They would doubt it in Rome if they knew the real figures. The Church in America is, in truth, a sad Church. It is all as a priest said in our last number, a section from the bleeding side of Ireland, and it is not able to retain what it gets. Look! In one city alone it loses, at a single stroke, twenty thousand souls! Who, in presence of such a dreadful truth, can say that the Church here gains more than it

loses—that it even preserves its natural integrity? For the twenty thousand in one city alone, does it gain twenty thousand throughout the whole remainder of the country? Ah, no! no! no! Had the poor parents of these twenty thousand children remained at home in Ireland, there had been no loss to the faith, because, though they had died early, leaving nothing to their children, vagrancy in Ireland does not entail the loss of faith. Such is the holy character of that country, that the fire of faith is always aglow in it. And New York is not the only *via crucis* the Church has in America. Philadelphia is not much less populous than New York. How many children are lost to the faith in this honest Quaker city every year? Count up our great cities. They are New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, New Orleans, Cincinnati, Chicago, Pittsburg, Charleston, Washington, etc., and to these may be added an immense number of very populous minor places. Taking the figures for New York to be correct, and the authority that gives them is reliable, it is a certain fact that not less than two hundred thousand baptized Irish Catholic children are lost every year to the faith in America. How true the great Archbishop Kendrick was, as a clergyman wrote in these columns last week, when he maintained that the Church here is constantly losing more than it gains! What does it gain? Emigrants—nothing but emigrants. What does it lose? The one case in issue shows that it loses every year two hundred thousand of the children of these same poor emigrants. What can be more unfortunate or degenerate than that? Two hundred thousand Irish children—the best Catholic stock in the world—lost every year!"

The *Tablet*, another Catholic organ, tries to whistle up its courage in the following *dead-march* style:

"But the actual number of conversions which annually take place, when we include the whole of our vast country, is very large, and must amount to many thousands, mostly from the more educated and enlightened class of non-Catholics. When we add to this the strong Catholic tendencies manifested in several Protestant sects, by a large and growing minority composed of the most intelligent and earnest portion of those sects, not only may Catholics hope and labor for the conversion of the country, but Protestants may well fear such conversion, and strive to avert it, though at present the majority of non-Catholics are drifting toward Rationalism and Naturalism; yet considering that there is nothing in either to satisfy the wants of the soul, we think Protestants are not alarmed wholly without reason, and that nothing is more natural than their recent combination to write our religion down. The Church has attractions which no form of Protestantism or Infidelity offers, or can offer; and if suffered to operate freely according to her own Divine laws, can not fail in the end to draw the whole population within her fold. Can effete Protestantism any longer prevent it?"

From these spicy extracts it will be seen that Rome is terribly perplexed, and that the most sagacious of her powerful pleaders are at their wits' end.*

* The *New York Advocate* concludes an article on the subject—"Romanism in the United States"—with these words:

"Three facts defeat Popery in this country. 1. It can not raise here a *native ministry*.

We take the following statistics from the *Almanac* of the Episcopal Church, for 1869:

Dioceses,	39	Baptisms—Infants,	26,835
Bishops,	47	" Adults,	7,067
Bishops elect,	2	" Not stated,	1,800
Priests and Deacons,	2,687	Confirmations,	21,958
Whole number of Clergy,	2,736	Communicants,	194,692
Parishes,	2,402	Marriages,	9,945
Ordinations—Deacons,	108	Burials,	15,346
" Priests,	98	Sunday-school Teachers,	21,711
Candidates for Orders,	331	" Scholars,	194,046
Churches Consecrated,	38	Contributions,	$4,457,888.28

This Church has been greatly agitated, during the last year, on the question whether ministers, not ordained according to Episcopal orders, have the right to officiate in the sacred office of a minister of the Gospel. The contention has raged furiously, one class denying the validity of the orders of the non-Episcopal ministers, and refusing to admit that they are, in any legitimate sense, ministers of the Gospel at all; another class acknowledging the validity of such orders, but not approving of any practical recogni-

Its young men of talent will not become priests. They are swayed too much by American ideas to do so. They do n't like celibacy; and other than ecclesiastical forms of public life, as well as the open doors for commercial or financial success, are too inviting. Here and there you can find a native priest, but they are anomalies. What now would become of the Methodist, the Baptist, Presbyterian, or even the Episcopal denomination, if they had to import continually an outlandish priesthood—men marked by their very 'brogue' as foreigners? They would, sooner or later, be enervated through all their ranks by the fact. Only while most of their people came from abroad like the priesthood, could they hold their own. Such a dependence is too anti-American to succeed in this New World. With the diminution of Irish immigration (and that has already commenced) Popery will have a rapid decadence. 2. Popery is universally felt to be abnormal in America. We all tolerate it, for toleration is a fundamental necessity of our political system; but no thoughtful citizen, not a Papist, can avoid the conviction, we might say the intuition, that not merely its hierarchical organization, but its whole genius, is incompatible with the spirit of the country. And we have only to open our eyes to see practical proof of the fact all around us. This is the great obstacle to its success here. Hence its comparatively few conversions from Protestantism; for whatever occasional ado is made over examples of proselytism, they are numerically insignificant, and incomparably fewer than the losses of the Church to other denominations. 3. But, again, Popery is smitten with general decay in Europe, and this fact affects it profoundly in America. Men do not care to sail on a sinking ship. The state of Romanism in Austria, Spain, Italy itself, shows that whatever may be its spasmodic efforts abroad, the foundations are sliding from beneath it in its oldest fortifications. Americans see this fact, and the public consciousness of the country tacitly recognizes Popery as an effete thing of the past.

"The easiest way to convert Papists is to let them come as fast as they please to America. We must suffer by their coming, but we are doing an incalculable good for Christendom by that suffering. Their children in the second, at farthest in the third, generation, are ours. The spirit of our free country dissolves and dispels the mediæval substance of Popery."

tion of it; while still a third party believe non-Episcopal ministers to be true ministers, and, accordingly, treat them as such. The *Protestant Churchman* belongs to the last class mentioned, and thus the editor expresses his convictions:

"Our ministerial brethren are just as dear to us as ever, and we hold their title to minister in holy things as valid and of Divine origin, and we do not propose to vary from our uniform policy of complete recognition and fraternal intercourse. . . . The General Convention, in enacting such a law, has transcended its rightful power, and no right-minded man will long hesitate in coming to a decision as to whether he is to obey fallible men, or Christ, to whom he owes paramount allegiance."

Here is an evidence of the fact, again, that the enlightened masses will not tamely submit to the mere assumptions of bishops and clergy, who give the inquiring people no other reasons for the doctrines imposed upon them than the mere *dogmata* of a carnalized Church. Manifestly, the people have lived on theological husks long enough. The people, like pale, sickly tubers, in a dark cellar, are reaching out after light. Here is a specimen of silly twaddle from the *Christian Witness and Church Advocate*, presenting more the appearance of a mountebank performance, or the freaks and fancies of monomaniacs, than the cool and deliberate actions of wise and conscientious men of God:

"The issue was not whether it is a breach of the rubric to direct a person not in the Episcopal orders to read the Declaration of Absolution. Nor was it decided whether 'exchanging' with non-Episcopal ministers is 'disorder,' or a breach of the ordination vow; nor whether it is illegal for an Episcopal clergyman to avail himself, in his public services, of the aid of a non-Episcopal minister. The single issue before the court was, whether it is a breach of our canon law for a clergyman of our Church to avail himself, in Divine worship, of the services of persons not ordained clergymen of our own particular Church. If the court had decided that it is a criminal offense for a clergyman to employ a person in the services, unless he has orders from our own Episcopate, it would have placed the stamp of illegality on lay reading; the chanting by choristers of those parts of the services assigned to the minister; addresses by Sunday-school Superintendents, and other lay 'preachings' which our bishops have encouraged, and which, in some relations, our canons have expressly sanctioned, applying to them the very term 'officiate.'"

The *Church Journal* goes straight against the word "Protestant," and perpetrates some sad anachronisms by trying to explain how, through some "inadvertence," that name, now, of a sudden so heartily despised, was introduced into the Prayer Book.

The golden-haired and highly-perfumed daughter of the "Mother Church" seems to be as deep down in the ditch of doubt and perplexity as her own *Alma Mater*, who burned Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley at the stake. Hear the protest of the *Journal:*

"In short, there are now two kinds of Protestantism—the Catholic and the anti-Catholic. The first is that of the Anglican Church; resisting, with a power that is felt and appreciated in the right quarter, the un-Catholic developments of the Church of Rome. The second is that of the non-Episcopal sects, resisting, not only the errors of Rome, but also the very Constitution, the Order, and much of the most sacred Faith of the Holy Catholic Church. If, by some confusion of thought in other times, or by some unexplained inadvertence, the name of 'Protestant' gained place on the title of the Prayer Book, let it not be thought by any Churchman that license is thereby given to blot out the very truths which God's saints have reverenced, and to join arms with others, lest, in assailing Rome with one hand they recklessly stab with the other their own Church—the mother who nourished them."

From the tables of the General Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal General Convention, the *Methodist* produces the following facts:

"The total number of members reported is 1,259,115—an increase over last year of 109,634. The number of infant baptisms is 46,207; of adults baptized, 67,065—giving a ratio of infant to adult baptisms of about two to three, and showing that but one infant has been baptized to about twenty-seven Church members, while more than one-half of those received into the Church have not been baptized in their infancy. These ratios vary in the different parts of the country. In six New England Conferences, the adults are about seven times as many as the infant baptisms, and one infant is baptized to about one hundred and forty-three members. In the Baltimore Conference we find the opposite extreme, there being six times as many children as adults baptized, and one infant baptism to about nine members. The other Conferences lie between these two extremes. The Methodist Church South is reported to aggregate a membership of 535,040 members and probationers, and 2,581 traveling and 3,952 local preachers. This membership, added to that of the Northern Church, makes a total of over one million and three quarters."*

Judging from these ratios of decrease on the practice of infant baptism compared with former years, we conclude that the practice is rapidly coming into disrepute, occasioned, we doubt not, by Bible investigation, and by the exposure of that Papal assumption through

*There are among us ten Methodist denominations: 1. The Methodist Episcopal Church, with nine Bishops, 8,481 traveling and 9,899 local preachers, and 1,225,115 members; 2. The Methodist Episcopal Church South, with —— Bishops, 2,581 traveling and 3,952 local preachers, and 535,040 members; 3. The Methodist Protestant Church, with 72,000 members; 4. The Methodist (Protestant) Church, with 640 traveling and 444 local preachers, and 50,000 members; 5. The Wesleyan Connection, with 15,000 members; 6. The Evangelical Association, with 500 preachers, and 64,814 members; 7. The African

constant debate. With the exception of Catholics and Episcopalians, this same proportionate decrease may be observed in every other Protestant Church. And we venture to assert that, from the same cause of close investigation on the part of the enlightened masses, there have been *more persons immersed* in the various Protestant denominations, according to the proportion of increase in adult membership, than ever before, since the organization of those various religious bodies. This phase of Church reformation is truly encouraging. By instituting a comparison of facts and figures, it can be observed that the increase and decrease of infant baptisms vary according to the religious enlightenment of any particular community. If the facts were produced, we feel assured that every body would be astonished to know how many immersed persons there are in the pedo-baptist Churches of the present day.

In respect to "Lay Representation" and the control of the funds of the Methodist Church, the *Methodist*, the most independent Protestant journal in America, says:

"We hold: 1. That the laity should participate in the control of the funds they contribute to the work of the Church. 2. That, in the absence of Lay Representation, the General Conference has very wisely committed the control of the funds and property of its great charities to joint Boards. 3. That before the assumption of the possessory rights of the connectional societies by the General Conference, it is most expedient that the laity should therein be represented. As the General Conference is receding from its old-time policy of non-interference in the management of the property interests of the Church, it is of the utmost importance that the way for such a great change in our government should be prepared by Lay Representation. Laymen once admitted to the General Conference, the whole economy of Methodism is simplified. The Church then, fully represented, controls all its own interests, spiritual and temporal."

Here is an acknowledgment of the fact that the people must be heard. The enlightened masses will not, in a free government, endure either religious or political centralization. There can be no monarchy where the Bible becomes the text-book of the nation. Even General Conferences must recede from their "old-time policy"

Methodist Episcopal Church, with 600 traveling preachers, and 200,000 members; 8. The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, with 694 preachers, and 164,000 members; 9. The Free Methodists, with 94 preachers, and 6,000 members; 10. The Primitive Methodists, with 20 traveling preachers, and 2,000 members. These figures aggregate 27,889 traveling and local ministers, with 2,359,966 members. Two of the denominations do not give their traveling and several do not give their local ministers.—*Compiled from the "Ecclesiastical Almanac" for* 1869.

of lording it over God's heritage. This demand for lay representation is the entering wedge that shall eventually lead to Church independency—even in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Methodist Church of the United States has appropriated, for the year 1869, *eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars* for home and foreign missions. This stands without a parallel in the history of the Protestant Church. Such missionary zeal and activity characterize no other Church of this age—not even the Roman Catholic. From the beginning they have been an extraordinary missionary people. Untiring zeal and devotion, united to unity of faith and unity of action, have produced these wonderful results. Let those who professedly stand on the apostolic platform note these facts, and realize, that if a Church, not by any means apostolic, can, by unity of faith and concentrated activity, extend the Methodist Church to such great proportions, certainly those who claim to occupy the vantage-ground should, in proportion to their means and opportunities, accomplish equally as much, if not much more.

The aggregate number of Presbyterians in the United States (embracing all branches of that body) stands at between four and five hundred thousand.* From what statistics we have read during the past year, we can not see that the Presbyterian Church has kept pace with other Churches. We think that, so far as her membership is concerned, if not actually on the decrease, the Church is standing still. It is a notable fact, that, in many portions of the country, *Calvinistic* Presbyterianism is dying out, or is being largely absorbed by the Congregational Church, and by other Churches. We are of the opinion that her moral forces are weakening every day. So many other Churches, of more extended views, and of a greater knowledge of the Bible, have so far outstripped her in all that pertains to mental activity and spiritual development, that by comparison she grows smaller every day; although it must be confessed, that so far as wealth and prestige, and learned and distinguished men are concerned, she has nothing to be ashamed of.

* 1. Old School Presbyterians, with 2,330 preachers, and 252,555 members; 2. New School Presbyterians, with 168 preachers, and 168,932 members; 3. United Presbyterians, with 401 preachers, and 65,612 members; 4. Cumberland Presbyterians, with 1,500 preachers, and 130,000 members; 5. Reformed Presbyterians, with 77 preachers, and 8,487 members; 6. Four Associate and Associate Reformed bodies, with 159 preachers, and 8,543 members; 7. Southern Presbyterians, with 786 preachers, and 76,949 members.—*Compiled from the "Ecclesiastical Almanac" for* 1869.

The following statistics, from the January number of the *Congregational Quarterly*, show conclusively that, at the present rate of increase, the day is not very far distant, when the Congregational Church will be far in advance of what the Presbyterian Church now is:

"It appears that the total number of churches in the United States is 2,951, a gain of 132. The number of ministers is 3,070, a gain therein of 99 since last year. The number of churches unsupplied with ministers is 5 less than last year; the number supplied, 149 greater. The number of Church members is 291,042, a net gain of 12,334. The additions by profession have been 16,432, a number exceeded in only two of the previous eleven years. Infant baptisms number 5,291, much above the average of the last eleven years. Sunday-schools report a membership of 339,205 in the United States, an increase in the United States of 25,334."

As a Protestant denomination, we regard it as approximating nearer the standard of the primitive Church, and as being less inclined to adhere to the dogmas of a creed than any other body of people in the United States, save the Church of Christ, as represented by the Disciples of Christ. In respect to Church government, in respect to their want of faith in special revelations beyond and above the Word of God, and in respect to the action of baptism and their repudiation of infant baptism, the people who compose that Church are positively and decidedly in advance of all Protestant competitors. The present form of Congregationalism varies in many respects from what it was one hundred years ago. They are anti-bishop, anti-ritualistic, decidedly anti-Pope, and plead common justice and equality for all men. We believe them to be less sectarian than any other Protestant Church, though there is room for much Scriptural improvement among that people. Though in many respects similar to the Presbyterian Church in polity, yet so far as the leaders of both organizations are concerned, we notice the fact that Presbyterian doctors of divinity are somewhat jealous of Congregational doctors of divinity.

The Baptist Church, in many portions of the country, is largely on the increase. Baptists of all sorts, in the United States, approximate probably one million of communicants.* Professedly a free

* They are separated into ten denominations: 1. Regular Baptists, with 8,346 preachers, and 1,094,806 members; 2. Southern Baptists, with its preachers and members not given; 3. Free-Will Baptists, with 1,161 preachers, and 61,244 members; 4. General Baptists, with 4,743 members; 5. Anti-Mission Baptists, with 105,000 members; 6. Six-Principle Baptists, with 3,000 members; 7. Winebrenarians (Church of God), with 32,000 members; 8. Seventh-Day Baptists, with 7,033 members; 9. Tunkers, with 20,000 members; 10. Mennonites, with 36,280 members.—*Compiled from the "Ecclesiastical Almanac" for* 1869.

religious people, and boasting of large liberty and freedom of conscience, we know of no people more religiously selfish and contracted, and of none less inclined to favor Christian Union than they. For several years they have been sweating and fretting over the question *whether baptism is to be regarded as an invariable prerequisite to communion*, for which there is express Scriptural command. Surely, if *immersion* was the only apostolic mode of baptism, this communion question is a singular one about which to raise a controversy. But in the Baptist Church we have two parties pulling two ways. The majority of them do not seem to comprehend the real question. They might as well be pedobaptists as what they are. According to apostolic teaching, in the primitive Church none were received as communicants except the baptized, and if immersion was the *only* recognized mode, then it follows, as a matter of course, that pedobaptists are not Scriptural communicants. The Baptists seem to be in a perfect muddle on this question. Baptists, to be consistent, must hold that immersion is prerequisite to communion with Christ. When they abandon that ground, they cease to be Baptists, and they are at once reduced to the rank of pedobaptists, and, therefore, they might as well cease from performing even sprinkling, and have no kind of baptism. A late writer in the *Spare Hour* declares:

"That it was not till 1833 that Dr. J. Newton Brown prepared what is known as 'The New Hampshire Confession of Faith,' (Baptist,) where, for the first time in the whole history of evangelical denominations, we find baptism declared to be a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper. The XIVth Article reads: 'We believe that Christian baptism is the immersion in water of a believer, into the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Savior, with its effect in our death to sin, and resurrection to a new life; that *it is a prerequisite to the privileges of a Church relation, and to the Lord's Supper.*' Since 1833 many Churches have adopted this confession, but unquestionably the great majority of Baptist Churches throughout this country own the Confession of 1689, better known as the Philadelphia Confession, which has no such exclusive clause."

Francis Wayland, on the score of general intelligence and *religious* honesty, was far in advance of the mass of his Baptist brethren. In his work entitled "*Principles and Practices of Baptists*," he says: "We baptize those who have been sprinkled in infancy, because we do not consider them to have been baptized. We consider ourselves not to *baptize again*, but to baptize those who never yet have submitted themselves to this ordinance. So with respect to restricted

communion, the doctrine held by most Baptists in this country. We, with most other denominations, believe that a person must be baptized before he is admitted to the ordinance of the Supper. If, then, we do not admit to the table of the Lord those whom we do not believe to be baptized, we do precisely the same as our brethren who differ from us." (Page 98.) But judging by the manner in which the Baptists of the present day are wrangling over this plain Scriptural matter, we must decide, much as we regret to do so, that Baptists are retrograding instead of advancing toward the apostolic standard.

The Lutheran Church does not by any means keep pace with other Protestant Churches, but is rather falling into the background, not only in respect to numbers, but in intellectual and moral force.* A large proportion of her membership is being absorbed by other Churches, such as evince more of the spirit of American enterprise and activity than the old stereotyped Lutheran Church. The following statistics from the *Lutheran* (one of their leading journals) show how that Church retains its identity:

"The vast immigration from Germany is doing for Lutheranism in this country what the Irish immigration has done for Romanism. While the united strength of the two schools of Presbyterianism will be a membership of 407,889, the Lutherans have a membership numbering but 56,029 less than that aggregate. The immigration from Germany is mainly composed of Prussian Protestants, and is rapidly increasing; and, ere long, the denomination will be inferior in numerical strength only to the Roman Catholics, Methodists, and Baptists. They greatly need a more numerous body of clergy—having but 1,748 ministers, while Presbyterians have 4,172. The Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, last year, graduated eleven theological students, and eight the previous year. Last year, the emigration from Germany to this country amounted to 124,803, being more than from Ireland."

The strength of the *German Reformed Church* is, possibly, one hundred and fifty thousand.† They increase with considerable rapidity in certain localities. Some eminent theologians stand connected with that body of people, among whom may be mentioned Drs. Nevin and Schaff. In some respects, they are in advance of their Protestant contemporaries. Their views on baptism and regeneration are much like those of Methodists. They have an "Order of Worship" prescribed in some of their Churches, and not a few of their pastors boldly advocate a "liturgical service."

* 1,792 ministers; 350,000 members.

† Reported: 505 ministers; 115,483 confirmed and 68,186 unconfirmed members.

The *Unitarians* are at sea without a compass. Below we present some figures and facts:

"The *Year Book*, published by the Unitarian Association, states that, within two years, fifty-one Unitarian churches have been built, enlarged, or otherwise improved, and that several are in process of erection which are not included in this number. It gives a list of 300 societies (65 of which have no settled minister) and 370 ministers. Many of the latter are retired, or, at least, without charge, and unwilling to settle. Besides the National Conference, and in connection with it, there are fourteen local Conferences in different parts of the country. There are thirteen ministerial associations, three theological schools, with sixty-seven students, and six publications. Three Conferences are organized under the name of Liberal Christians—one in Central New York, one in Maine, and there are five Christian Unions, one in each of the cities of Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Washington, and Chicago."

They seem not to be in agreement among themselves. They lack unity, have no fixed basis of principles, and oscillate from point to point, according to the caprices of the leaders. Dr. Bellows, writing to the *Examiner*, and commenting on the action of unbelievers, in one of their late Conferences, says:

"It is our sad conviction that rationalistic and semi-Christian, or anti-Christian, proclivities and opinions prevail in our body much more extensively than is confessed, or even known; and that they require kind, tender, serious, but also frank, and positive, vigorous opposition. If they can not be checked by this process, the body can not long hold together. We fully believe that, if well understood, clearly faced, and thoughtfully considered, these semi-Christian, or unchristian, ideas would not be welcomed, approved, or accepted. To make them better understood ought to be the painstaking effort of all believers in the Gospel and Church of Jesus Christ."

Where a people have no central idea of cohesion, what else can we expect more than the foregoing statements? The same may, with equal propriety, be said of the Universalists, who have no other bond of union beyond that of common fraternity. We can not see that either of these parties advance, in the least, the common cause of Christianity. A committee, at the same convention, reporting on the destitution of Unitarian literature, reported as follows:

"We have no edition of the Bible which can be read in our families with full confidence in its representation of the original text, or in the notes by which it is accompanied. We have no introduction to the Bible for general use; no popular commentary on the Old Testament; no complete commentary on the New. We have no Unitarian ecclesiastical history. The want is deeply felt of more books of a devotional and meditative character."

Where there is no Christ—the Son of God—why deplore the want of a Christian literature? Literature on Freemasonry or Odd-Fellowism would answer the same purpose. A New York correspondent of the *Watchman and Reflector*, some time since, wrote as follows:

"There was a prospect, some time since, that both of the Universalist societies in Brooklyn would be abandoned. The handsome stone edifice on the heights has been sold to the Swedenborgians. The pastor of the other society has left for want of a support, and that house is advertised for sale. An attempt has now been made to unite the two, so that the cause may be saved. Fifty years ago, Mr. Mitchell alone represented the sect in New York. He was of the Murray school, and preached decidedly and vigorously the doctrines that cluster around the Trinity. He thought punishment would eventually come to an end. When the new order of Universalism arose, that preached death and glory, and taught that death put a full and final period to all punishment, and denied the divinity of the Savior, Mr. Mitchell refused to recognize their ministers as Christians. He stood alone to the day of his death, and his church is now occupied by the Romanists. The Universalists have formed many societies in this city, the greater number of which have been short-lived. Dr. Chapin's Church, and that on Bleecker-street, are all that amount to any thing in this city. Chapin's congregation is held together by the magnetism of his own eloquence. Besides the two congregations in Brooklyn, which are near their end, it is not known that there is a single society on Long Island."

What is denominated Christian Union was the theme of much agitation during the year 1868. From present appearances the agitation will increase. Whether the discussion of this subject shall result in true *Christian* unity, or simply in sectarian consolidation, is yet to be seen. The result, so far, is thus summed up by the *Methodist:*

"Among the denominations generally comprised under the name Evangelical, the desire of a closer union is still gaining strength. No corporate union of entire Churches has taken place during the past year, except that the Free-will Baptists, at their Triennial Convention, were joined by several associations of 'General Baptists.' But the union movements among the Methodist and Presbyterian denominations still successfully advance toward a consummation, which, in several cases, may be reached in the present year. But, though most of the Protestant denominations do not yet see their way clear toward the establishment of one organic body, which would do away with the distinctive marks of denominationalism, there is a general desire to recognize the substantial unity of spirit which already exists between them, and to give it expression. State and National Christian Conventions and Societies largely increase in number, and the idea of the great mission of the Evangelical Alliance, as the bond of Protestant Churches, is striking deep root. A new General Assembly of delegates from all the Protestant Churches of the world has been called, to meet in the city of New York, in

October, 1869. This Assembly will meet only a few weeks before the Ecumenical Council which the Pope has called for December, 1869, and will be the best reply the Protestant world can give to the Pope's letter to Protestants, inviting them to unite with the Church of Rome."

There was *talk* of union between the Episcopalians and Methodists, but neither organization seemed very much disposed to enter into a copartnership. The elements were antagonistic. There was considerable talk between Baptists and the Disciples of Christ on the subject of Church Union. The bitter Baptists, who are thoroughly saturated with the spirit of sectarianism, heartily opposed this move. But, nevertheless, by the process of disintegration, many Baptists are uniting with the people styled the *Disciples of Christ**—a people who reject all creeds and confessions of faith, except the Bible, and who propose Christian Union alone on "*the one foundation*," as declared by the inspired Apostles.

* This denomination is a branch of the Baptist denominations. It holds to no rule of faith but the Word of God, and rejects all doctrines or terms as binding which are founded on speculations of theology. It grew into a separate denomination under the influence of the example and teachings of Thomas Campbell, who settled in Pennsylvania in 1808, as a minister of the "Seceders," and of his son Alexander. The father was a conscientious advocate of religious reform, and contended for a restoration of the Christian Church to apostolic practice and precept. His son Alexander joined him, and they formed a small association of disciples for the special study of the Scriptures, who were to reject all creeds. This grew into a congregation, of which the Campbells became elders. An investigation of the subject of baptism led them to the belief that immersion was the only Scriptural method. For some years the Churches which were formed were attached to associations of Baptists. The history of their separation from the Baptists is thus given in *M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopædia:*

"In 1823 Alexander Campbell established the *Christian Baptist*. Through this monthly, and several public oral debates on baptism, and extensive tours of preaching, his views spread rapidly and widely among the Baptists. But personal opposition at last took the form of ecclesiastical action, and, in 1827, the Dover Association of Virginia decreed the excommunication from Baptist fellowship of all who held and advocated the views of Alexander Campbell. This was the beginning of a general action among the Baptists, and the Reformers, as they were called, were compelled to associate in a separate organization, which rapidly increased, especially in Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Virginia. Churches were also formed in the British Provinces of North America, in England, Wales, Ireland, and Australia. They are increasing in all these countries, and in England are rapidly becoming numerous."

The Disciples are Congregational in their organization; regard very highly the obligation to provide for the preaching of the Gospel; are active and energetic, and accord, in essential doctrines, with "Evangelical" Christians. Their colleges are: Bethany College, Kentucky University, the North-Western Christian University, at Indianapolis, Indiana; Eureka College, Illinois, and Hiram College, Ohio. They have twenty-five periodicals, namely, nine weeklies, fifteen monthlies, and one quarterly. Of these, *two* (monthlies) are published, one in Great Britain and one in Canada; all the rest in the United States. They have 5,000 churches and 500,000 members.—*Ecclesiastical Almanac*, 1869.

The question of Christian Union seems to be forcing itself upon the attention of the popular religious leaders of the present day. There is no escape—the question is upon us, and discussion must go on, until either a positive or a negative result is gained. The *Methodist*, commenting at length on this vital and all-absorbing question, thus dilates:

"We know of nothing that appeals more strongly to evangelical Protestants of all Churches in behalf of the union movements which are now auspiciously progressing in our own and other countries. How would it strengthen the hands of Methodist missionaries in China if, instead of Methodist Episcopal, Southern Methodist, English Wesleyan, English New Connection, English United Methodist missionaries being sent out, the efforts of all American and English Methodists could be united for the planting of Methodist missions! How much confusion it would save the pagans, who are favorably inclined toward Christianity, if no Protestant Churches had ever been divided by such distractions as now separate the Old, New School, Reformed, Cumberland, Church of Scotland, Free Church of Scotland Presbyterians, and the several branches of the Reformed Churches! Viewed in this light, the many union movements now going on in the Christian Church, the progress of which we have regularly chronicled in our columns, can not but be a cause of great joy to every Protestant."

"Irenæus," of the *New York Observer*, writes on Christian Union frequently; and lately, while commenting on the prayer of Christ for the unity of His people, expressed himself thus:

"Christians ought to be getting more and more closely to each other. They are strong in Christ; strong when united; they are like the Son only when united; they are his witnesses that He came from God when they are one in Him."

That is, indeed, a strong proposition. Why not work up to it by abandoning all sorts of sectarian shibboleths? As another evidence of the growing sentiment of Christian union we mention, with peculiar pleasure, the fact that, but a few months since, at the "Clinton Avenue Congregational Church," Brooklyn, "Christians of all evangelical denominations" "sat down together in brotherly concord at the communion table of their common Lord and Savior."

We are of the opinion that sectarianism has reached its culmination. From this time forward it must recede from its present high point of oscillation. Dr. Ewer, of the Episcopal Church, who recently published "*Sermons on the Failure of Protestantism*," unfolded more facts, and revealed more truths, than were pleasant or profitable to Protestant tastes. Protestantism, as at present represented by antagonistic sectarian parties, *is a failure*, so far as the conversion of

the world is concerned, and, unless there is a speedy return to the Bible and to apostolic teaching, as well as an utter repudiation of all things spiritual not sanctioned by the Word of God, the statement of this distinguished divine must stand unchallenged, unsavory as the *melange* may seem.

This dear doctor discovers the disease of Protestantism; but the remedy he proposes is not the "balm of Gilead." As the Pope of Rome has graciously invited all Protestants and infidels to flee to his bosom for refuge from the stormy blasts, so has the benevolent Dr. Ewer sent out glazed cards of invitation to all disaffected Protestant parties, stipulating, in cosmetic phrase, that the Episcopal Church is the city of refuge on the other side of Jordan.

None of these doctors of divinity reach the seat of the disease. We believe the Disciples of Christ (as they prefer to be called) are the only people who can read the diagnosis, and apply the remedy. They stop within the pale of no Protestant party to find the basis of Christian Union. They go beyond Protestantism, and beyond the Catholic and Greek Churches. They have no sympathy in a plea for Protestant union. Such a union would be one of policy and not of principle. The Disciples of Christ propose a radical change—not simply one of expedients. In order to consummate the lasting union of the Lord's people, the Disciples, who, without boasting, stand in advance of all parties on the method of such a union, propose:

1. The suppression of all unscriptural terms, and the introduction of a "pure speech."

2. The destruction of theological terminologies, of all mystical verbiage, and of all untaught philosophical, or rather sophistical, questions.

3. The elimination of all such unscriptural, and therefore sinful, designations as *Episcopal* Church, *Presbyterian* Church, *Methodist* Church, *Baptist* Church, and so on.

4. The destruction of sporadic sects by the Scriptural identification of Christ's Church.

5. The abolishment of creedism, and the proclamation of the "*one* body, the *one* Spirit, the *one* Lord, the *one* faith, the *one* baptism, the *one* foundation."

6. The dissolution of all centralized ecclesiastical governments, and the establishment of congregational independency.

III.—THE GLORIES OF MARY.

The Glories of Mary. Translated from the Italian of ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI, founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. First American edition. New York: James B. Kirker.

BUT few Protestants are apprised of the existence of the book whose title we have placed at the head of this paper. Fewer still are aware of its surprising contents. *It is not intended for Protestant eyes.* And, when our readers shall have perused the extracts which we shall publish from it, they will not doubt that "the faithful" will witness this advertisement of their carefully-guarded treasure with wailing and gnashing of teeth. It is *esoteric* Catholicism—revealing its inner spirit, its *genuine* doctrine, in contrast with the Jesuitical representations of that doctrine.

We are told by the artful missionaries, whose influence now directs and controls most, if not all, of the Romish operations in this country, that the Catholic Church trusts alone in the merits of the Lord Jesus for salvation; that he is the sole fountain of grace and life, and the one mediator between God and men. As for the Blessed Virgin, they assure us that no Catholic pays *divine* honors to her. They even hold up their hands in holy horror that the Church should be *so* slandered and injured! If pressed to say what is the real position assigned to Mary, they tell us that the Church regards her as a bright example of purity and virtue; that she is believed to feel a lively interest in the welfare of all good Catholics, and to pray for them in heaven the same as if she were still on earth; and that it is quite as proper to *ask* an interest in her prayers now as it would be were she still living among us. And this is all! The only *praying* that is done *to her* is to *ask* her to pray for *us*. And the idea that Catholics put their *trust* in her; expect to be *saved* by her; that they really *worship* her—why, it is too monstrous for belief!

This is *exoteric* Catholicism—that which is put forward to catch the simple and unwary. And, alas, how many have accepted some such statement as a correct representation of the true doctrine of the Church respecting Mary!

Now we are, fortunately, prepared to *demonstrate* the following propositions as the *genuine teaching* and *sincere faith* of the Catholic Church:

1. That Mary *coöperated* in the original work of human redemption.
2. That *she herself* conquered hell, and crushed the head of the serpent.
3. That she is *now* the *only Savior* of sinners.
4. That she is *Omnipotent.*
5. That she is *Queen of the Universe.*
6. That God himself is *under obligation*, and is *indebted* to her.
7. That, while she is represented as obtaining favors for mankind by prayer, her *petitions* are really *commands to God!*

We ask no man to believe that the Romish Church cherishes sentiments, and teaches doctrines, so antichristian and blasphemous, without *clear, explicit, abundant, and irrefragable proof.* If we do not demonstrate every one of the above propositions beyond all possible mistake or doubt, then let it be said that we have borne false witness. Our proofs shall be drawn from no Protestant source; they shall not be the repudiated revelations of some Maria Monk; nor the disturbed utterances of an obscure and infatuated devotee; but the sober, deliberate, matured, and *approved* declarations of Abbots, Bishops, and Saints.

"The Glories of Mary," from which our testimonies shall be taken, is a *Catholic book*, published by a *Catholic house*, for the use of the *Catholic public of America.* Being a translation, it is introduced with the trust "that it will be found to retain the spirit of the learned and *saintly* author, and that it will be welcomed by *the faithful* in this country with the same *delight* which it has *universally called forth in Catholic Europe.*" Lest some of the faithful should doubt the correctness of the *translation*, even *this* is guarded against, and the work, in its present form, is commended to the unhesitating acceptance of all by this *official* and *authoritative* indorsement:

"This new and improved translation of 'The Glories of Mary' having been *duly examined*, is hereby *approved* of. †JOHN,
"*New York, Jan.* 21, 1852. *Archbishop of New York.*"

It will suffice to say of the author that he was himself a Bishop, appointed in 1762, by Pope Clement XIII. He was released from

this office, at his own request, by Pius VI, in 1775, being "old, sickly, and so exhausted by fasting and penance" that he was no longer able to perform its duties. In 1787 he died, at the advanced age of ninety years. But such was his reputation for piety and sanctity that, in the year 1816, his name was enrolled upon the calendar of Romish Saints, which is proof positive to all devout Catholics that "there must have been at least three *undeniable miracles* performed after his death through his invocation"—miracles that "were attested on oath by unimpeachable witnesses before a court of the most intelligent and upright men." (See Bull of Canonization.)

We mention all these circumstances to show that there is no possibility of evading the conclusion that *the doctrine* of this book is really and truly the doctrine of the Catholic Church. For certainly no Bishop of that Church, who lived and died in its communion, and who was afterward canonized or enrolled as a saint, and the very invocation of whose name served to work miracles, can be regarded as heretic, or as holding and teaching any thing but genuine and approved Catholic doctrine. Then he declares, on the fly-leaf of this work, that he is "an obedient son of the holy Roman Catholic Church and the holy Apostolic See," and, therefore, he adds, "to their judgment, I submit myself and *whatever I have written in this book.*"

Like all Catholic books, this one was carefully and duly examined by high Catholic officials before it was published, to see if it contained a *line,* or even a *word,* that was not perfectly in harmony with the faith and doctrines of the Church, and if so, to *strike it out,* or "expurgate" it. They *approved* it—authorized its publication, commended and indorsed it to "the faithful" as containing nothing but sound and wholesome Catholic doctrine; and, as such, they received it, and read it with universal delight. *It was after this that the author was enrolled as a Saint.* The translation from which we shall quote has passed the very same scrutiny, has been duly examined, and, as we have seen, is officially indorsed and *approved of.* There can be no sort of question, therefore, *that whatever this book teaches is to-day the deliberate, matured, carefully expressed, solemnly tested, and approved doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.*

So much for the *authority* of the work. Now let us see if it teaches the propositions which we have submitted. The first is:

1. That Mary coöperated in the Original Work of Human Redemption.

Under this head we direct attention to the following extracts, noting in every place the page, that they may be verified:

"It is true, that in dying for the redemption of the world, Jesus wished to be alone. I have trodden the wine-press alone, 'Torcular calcavi solus.' But when God saw the great desire of Mary to devote herself to the salvation of men, he ordained that by the sacrifice and offering of the life of this same Jesus, *she might coöperate with him in the work of our salvation*, and thus become mother of our souls." (P. 43.)

"St. Bernard says, that as a man and a woman have coöperated for our ruin, so it was fit that another man and another woman should *coöperate for our restoration; and these were Jesus and his mother Mary.* Doubtless, says the Saint, Jesus Christ, alone, was all-sufficient for our redemption; yet it was more fitting that *each sex should take part in our redemption*, when both took part in our corruption. For this reason, blessed Albertus Magnus calls Mary the *coöperatrix with Christ in our redemption*—'Adjutrix Redemptionis.' And she, herself, revealed to St. Bridget, that as Adam and Eve sold the world for one apple, so her *Son and herself*, with one heart, *redeemed the world.* God could indeed, as St. Anselm asserts, create the world from nothing; but when it was lost by sin *he could not redeem it without the coöperation of Mary.*" (P. 185.)

We had marked several other passages for quotation, but these are so direct and unambiguous that we must regard them as sufficient upon the first proposition. Let us proceed to establish, in like manner, the next—

2. That She Conquered Hell and Crushed the Head of the Serpent.

The evidence on this point is equally clear and abundant:

"Not only most holy Mary is Queen of Heaven and of the Saints, but also of hell and the devils, for she has bravely *triumphed over them by her virtues.* From the beginning of the world God predicted to the infernal serpent *the victory* and the empire which *our Queen would obtain over him*, when he announced to him that *a woman* would come into the world who *should conquer him.* 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman; *she shall crush thy head.*" (P. 155.)

"Mary, then, is this great and strong woman who *has conquered the devil and crushed his head* by subduing his pride; as the Lord added, 'She shall crush thy head.' Some of the commentators doubt whether these words refer to Mary or to Jesus Christ, because in the Septuagint version* we read: 'He shall crush thy head.' But *in our vulgate*, which is *the only version approved by the Council of Trent*, it is *she* and *not* he. . . . St. Bruno says, that Eve, by yielding to the serpent, brought into the world death and darkness, but that the Blessed Virgin, by

* And certainly also in the original Hebrew.

conquering the devil, brought us life and light. And *she* has bound him so that he can not move to do the least harm to her servants." (P. 156.)

"As men, says Thomas à Kempis, fall to the earth through fear, when a thunder-bolt strikes near them, so *fall prostrate the devils* when *but the name* of Mary is heard." (P. 162.)

"Very glorious, O Mary, and wonderful, exclaims St. Bonaventure, is *thy great name.* Those who are mindful to utter it at the hour of death *have nothing to fear from hell,* for the devils at once abandon the soul *when they hear the name of Mary.*" (P. 163.)

This doctrine is sufficient, one would think, to blast forever the pretensions of the Church which teaches it. But worse, if possible, is yet to be exhibited. If we establish the next proposition by proofs equally explicit and conclusive, all that follows will serve but to show the depths to which it is possible for apostates to fall. We state it once more:

3. That Mary is now the only Savior of Sinners.

We freely admit that Jesus Christ is more than once *called,* in this book, *the only Savior;* but that this is simply an empty and unmeaning title, as applied to him, will become perfectly evident as we proceed; for it will be seen that in truth and fact *Mary* is regarded as *the one sole fountain* of grace, life, and salvation, and that Jesus Christ has nothing whatever to do with it. Owing to the peculiar construction of the book, we can not fully present this proof without the introduction of matter applicable to one or two of our remaining propositions. But our readers will be indulgent. We submit, first of all, the following:

"The kingdom of God consisting of justice and mercy, the Lord has *divided* it; he has reserved *the kingdom of justice for himself,* and he has granted *the kingdom of mercy to Mary,* ordaining that *all the mercies* which are dispensed to men should pass through the hands of Mary, and should be *bestowed according to her good pleasure.* St. Thomas confirms this in his preface to the Canonical Epistles, saying that the holy virgin, when she conceived the Divine Word in her womb, and brought him forth, obtained the half of the kingdom of God by becoming *Queen of Mercy,* Jesus Christ remaining King of Justice." (Pp. 27, 28.)

"Ernest, Archbishop of Prague, also says, that the eternal Father has given to the Son the *office* of *judging* and *punishing,* and *to the mother, the office of compassionating and relieving the wretched.*" (P. 29.)

"St. Bernard asks: 'Why does the Church name Mary *Queen of Mercy?*' And answers: 'Because we believe that *she* opens the depths of the mercy of God, *to whom she will, when she will, and as she will;* so that not even the vilest sinner is lost, if *Mary protects him.*'" (P. 31.)

As, then, it is only by mercy that we can be saved, and as Mary is the *sole* Queen and dispenser of mercy, it follows that she is the *only Savior.* Again, as *judging* and *punishing* can not save us, and as these are all that are left to Christ, it follows that he has now *nothing to do with saving us.* These, it is true, are but inferences. We believe them to follow necessarily from the premises, but we have *positive and direct proof.* As this pertains to a variety of subjects, we classify them for convenience of reference.

MARY THE ONLY HOPE AND REFUGE.

"St. Augustine rightly calls her the *only hope of us sinners*, since by *her* means *alone* we hope for *the remission of all our sins.* And St. John Chrysostom repeats the same thing, namely, that sinners receive pardon *only* through the intercession of Mary." (Pp. 83, 84.)

"Behold, O mother of my God, Mary, *my only hope*, behold at thy feet a miserable sinner, who implores *thy* mercy. Thou art proclaimed and called *by the whole Church*, and by *all* the faithful, *the refuge* of sinners; thou art my refuge; it is *thine* to save me." (P. 88.)

"Fly, O Adam, O Eve, and ye their children who have offended God; fly and take refuge in the bosom of this good mother. Do you not know that she is the *only city of refuge*, and the *only hope of sinners?*" (P. 129.)

"O Mary, we poor sinners know *no refuge but thee.* Thou art our *only hope;* to thee we *intrust* our salvation." (P. 130.)

"Hence Erasmus thus salutes the Virgin: 'Hail, terror of hell! hail, *hope of* Christians! *Confidence in thee* secures salvation.'" (P. 260.)

MARY IS THE SAVIOR IN FACT.

"Look upon me, and do not leave me until *thou* hast changed me *from a sinner into a saint.*' (P. 38.)

"If he comes with a good intention, though he have committed all the sins in the world, she embraces him, and this loving *mother* condescends to *heal all the wounds of his soul.*" (P. 71.)

"St. Ephraim thus salutes the *divine* mother: 'Hail, hope of the soul! hail, secure salvation of Christians! hail, helper of sinners! hail, defense of the faithful, and *salvation of the world!*'" (P. 117.)

"Richard of St. Laurence says: '*Our salvation is in the hands of* Mary.' . . . Cassian absolutely affirms that *the salvation of the whole world depends upon the favor and protection of Mary.*" (P. 190.)

"I invoke, then, thy aid, O my great *advocate*, my refuge, my hope, and my mother Mary. To *thy hands* I commit the cause of my *eternal* salvation. To thee I consign my soul; it was lost, but *thou must save it.*" (P. 239.)

"St. Bonaventure addresses her thus: 'Blessed are those who know thee, O mother of God! for to *know thee* is the path to *immortal life*, and to publish thy virtues is *the way to eternal salvation.*'" (P. 279.)

"St. Bernardine of Sienna says, that God did not destroy man after his fall, because of the peculiar love that he bore *his future child Mary.* And the saint adds,

that he doubts not all the mercy and pardon which sinners received under the Old Law, was granted them by God *solely for the sake* of this blessed virgin." (P. 81.)

If any one, after reading these testimonies, can still doubt that Mary is looked upon as the only Savior of sinners, we ask him next to consider that

ALL GRACE IS IN MARY.

"Behold, O man! the design of God, a design arranged for our benefit, that he may be able to bestow upon us more abundantly his compassion; for wishing to redeem the human race, *he has placed* the price of our redemption *in the hands of Mary*, that she may dispense it at *her* pleasure." (P. 118.)

"St. Irenæus says that the Divine Word, before incarnating himself in the womb of Mary, sent the archangel to obtain her consent, because *he would have the world indebted to Mary for the mystery of the incarnation.* Also the Idiot remarks, that every blessing, every help, *every grace* that men have received or will receive from God, to the end of the world, has come to them, and will come to them, through the intercession *and by means of* Mary." (Pp. 118, 119.)

"St Germanus, recognizing Mary to be *the source* of every blessing and the deliverance from every evil, thus invokes her: 'O my lady, thou alone art my help,'" etc. (P. 119.)

"The *holy Church*, in the office which she *requires* to be recited on the festivals of Mary, applying to her the words of Wisdom, gives us to understand that *in Mary* we shall find every hope: 'In me is all hope of life and virtue.' That *in Mary* we shall find *every grace:* 'In me is all grace of the way and of the truth.' In a word, that we shall find *in Mary life and eternal salvation.*" (Pp. 173, 174.)

"O, how many, exclaims the Abbot of Celles, who merit to be condemned by the Divine justice, *are saved by the mercy of Mary!* for she is the treasure of God and the *treasurer of all graces;* therefore it is that *our salvation is in her hands.* Let us always, then, have recourse to this mother of mercy, and confidently hope to be saved by means of her intercession; since *she*, as Bernardine de Bustis encourages us to believe, is *our salvation, our life*, our hope, our counsel, our refuge, our help. *Mary is that very throne of grace*, says St. Antoninus, to which the apostle exhorts us to have recourse with confidence, that we may obtain the Divine mercy, with all needed help for our salvation." (P. 300.)

MARY IS THE DOOR OF HEAVEN.

"For this reason, too, she is called *the gate of heaven* by the holy Church: 'Felix cœli porta;' because as every rescript of grace, sent by the King, comes through the palace gate, so it is given to Mary, that through her thou shouldst receive whatever thou hast. St. Bonaventure, moreover, says that Mary is called the gate of heaven, because *no one can enter heaven* if he does not pass *through Mary, who is the door of it.*" (P. 177.)

"Open to us, O Virgin, heaven, for *thou hast the keys of it.* Nay, thou art even *the gate* of it, as *the holy Church* names thee, 'Janua cœli.'" (P. 278.)

We omit numerous passages declaring that she is the "propitiatory" or mercy-seat, the "ark of the covenant," the "ladder of paradise," "the most true mediatrix between God and men," the doctrine

being "that Jesus Christ is the only *mediator of justice*," but that "the great privilege has been granted to Mary to be *the mediatrix of salvation;* not, indeed, mediatrix of justice, *but of grace.*" (P. 169.) We shall conclude our quotations in support of our third proposition with the following:

"O woman, blessed among all women, thou art the honor of the human race, *the salvation* of our people. Thou hast *a merit that has no limits*, and an *entire power* over *all* creatures. Thou art the mother of God, the mistress of the world, the Queen of heaven. Thou art the *dispenser of all graces*, the *glory* of the *holy Church.* Thou art the example of the just, the consolation of the saints, and *the source of our salvation.* Thou art the joy of paradise, the *gate of heaven*, the *glory of God.*" (P. 673.)

We need not offer a single word of comment. We address intelligent readers, and such can not fail to see that according to this Church, in its most devout and solemn utterances, Mary is the only hope and refuge, the only dependence, the only source of salvation, the only dispenser of grace, the only mediatrix of salvation, the only propitiatory, the only throne of grace, and hence, necessarily, *the only Savior.* If this *woman* fails to save, Romanists have no hope. May God open their eyes to see that Jesus Christ is the only Savior, and that there is no other name under the whole heavens given among men by which we can be saved. (Acts iv, 12.)

We shall occupy but little space in proving our remaining propositions. We have said that the Catholic Church teaches

4. That Mary is Omnipotent.

This would follow as a necessary consequence from the doctrine which we have already considered. But it may be well to show that the Church does not shrink from this consequence, but boldly and unequivocally avows it.

"Do not say that thou canst not aid me, for I know that *thou art omnipotent*, and dost obtain whatever thou desirest from God." (P. 78.)

"O Lady, protect me, this is all I ask. If thou dost protect me I fear nothing. I do not fear the demons, for thou art *more powerful* than *all the spirits of hell;* nor *my sins*, for *one word of thine* in my behalf can obtain pardon of them all from God. If I have thy favor I do not fear *even the anger of God*, for he is appeased by one prayer of thine. In a word, if thou dost protect me, I hope all things, because *all things are possible with thee.*" (P. 199.)

"Says St. Peter Damian, *the Virgin has all power in heaven as on earth.*" (P. 201.)

"Yes, *Mary is omnipotent*, adds Richard of St. Laurence, since the queen, by every law, must enjoy the same privileges as the king. For as *the power of the Son and mother are the same*, the mother by the omnipotent Son *is made*

omnipotent. And St. Antoninus says: God has placed the whole Church, not only under the patronage, but also under the dominion of Mary." (P. 203.)

"Holy Virgin, mother of God, succor those who implore thy assistance. Turn to us. But, *having been deified*, as it were, hast thou forgotten men? Ah, certainly not! Thou knowest in what peril thou hast left us, and the wretched condition of thy *servants;* no, it is not befitting a mercy so great, to forget so great misery as ours. Turn to us with thy power, because he who is powerful hath given thee *omnipotence in heaven and on earth. To thee nothing is impossible.*" (P. 331.)

The extracts introduced under our third proposition anticipated in part the proof of the fifth, namely:

5. MARY IS QUEEN OF THE UNIVERSE.

It will, however, be proper to introduce two or three brief passages more, to confirm what has already been incidentally introduced.

"Continue, Mary, continue in security to reign; dispose *according to thy will* of every thing belonging to thy Son, for thou, being mother and spouse of the King of the world, the *kingdom* and power *over all creatures* is *one* to thee as queen." (P. 26.)

"As she is the mother of the Lord of paradise, she is with reason, also, says Rupert, the Lady of paradise. *She* possesses, by *right*, the *whole kingdom* of her Son." (P. 280.)

"Make us on earth thy faithful servants, that we may thus go to bless thee in paradise. On this day, when thou hast been made *queen of the universe*, we also consecrate ourselves to thy service." (P. 514.)

But two propositions remain to be established, namely:

6. THAT GOD HIMSELF IS UNDER OBLIGATION, AND IS INDEBTED TO MARY.

7. THAT HER PETITIONS ARE REALLY COMMANDS TO GOD.

We shudder while writing these horrid sentiments. But a stern requirement of duty to God and to man leaves us no election. The time has come when the inner temple of Catholicism must be opened to the inspection of the world, that all may see it as it is, and that those who embrace it may know *what* they embrace. Hence we ask our readers, however they may loathe and detest the abominable utterances which follow, to *read* them, and to *remember* them.

"Nothing resists thy power, since thy Creator and ours, while he honors thee as his mother, considers thy glory as his own, and exulting in it as a son, grants thy petitions as if he were *discharging an obligation*. . . . . Though Mary is under an infinite obligation to her Son for having elected her to be his mother, yet it can not be denied that the Son also is *greatly indebted to his mother* for having given him his human nature; whence Jesus, as if to recompense Mary *as he ought*, while he enjoys this his glory, honors her especially by always graciously listening to her prayers." (Pp. 33, 34.)

"The Son has so great regard for the prayers of Mary, and so great a desire to please her, that when she prays, she seems *to command rather than request*, and to be *a mistress* rather than a *handmaid*." (P. 202.)

"St. Bernardine of Sienna does not hesitate to say that *all obey the commands of Mary*, EVEN GOD HIMSELF." (P. 202.)

"The blessed Albertus Magnus represents Mary speaking thus: 'I must be asked to wish, for if I wish *it must be done*.'" (P. 204.)

"The Abbot Godfrey says that Mary, *although she obtains favors by praying*, yet prays with a kind of *maternal authority*." (P. 208.)

"The prayers of the blessed Virgin, being the prayers of a mother, have a *certain kind of authority*; hence it is *impossible* that she should not be heard when she prays." (P. 209.)

"St. George, Archbishop of Nicomedia, even adds, that Jesus Christ grants to his mother all her petitions, as if to satisfy *the obligation that he is under to her* for having caused by her consent that the human race should be given him. Wherefore, St. Methodius, the martyr, exclaims: 'Rejoice, O Mary, that a son has fallen to thy lot *as thy debtor*, who gives to all and receives from none.'" (P. 210.)

"She knows so well how to appease the Divine justice with her tender and wise entreaties, that God himself blesses her for it, and, as it were, *thanks her*, that thus she restrains him from abandoning and punishing them as they deserve." (P. 220.)

"Rejoice, O mother and handmaid of God! rejoice! rejoice! thou hast *for a debtor* him to whom all creatures owe their being. We are all debtors to God, *but God is a debtor to thee*." (P. 327.)

We conclude our testimonies with an extract from the prayer of St. Ephraim, which clearly *deifies* the Virgin:

"I salute thee, O great mediatrix of peace between men and God; O mother of Jesus our Lord, the love of all men and of God; *to thee be honor and blessing with the Father and with the Holy Spirit. Amen*." (P. 781.)

We have no heart for commenting upon these extracts, and, indeed, no comment is necessary. Their meaning is plain, and their doctrine unmistakable. No intelligent man can read them without being fully convinced that the Church which has produced, published, accepted, and indorsed them, actually and expressly substitutes Mary, to all intents and purposes, for the Lord Jesus Christ. Salvation, grace, mercy, pardon, refuge, hope, mediation, eternal life—every thing, in short, which a *Christian* finds in Christ, and only in Christ, the members of this Church believe they find in Mary, and *only in Mary*, consequently *not* in Christ! It is true he is regarded as having performed originally a certain part in the work of redemption, but then he retired, placing all the treasures of grace and salvation in her hands, to be dispensed according to her good pleasure, to whom she will, when she will, and as she will. Mary is *now* the

Savior, and Christ is only a Judge and Executioner. She is the mediatrix between us and his wrath, and whatever he does for us in the form of grace or mercy, he does in *obedience* to her *imperative petitions!*

We wish also to direct special attention to the fact that this is not merely what Rome *used* to hold and teach. Though this is rather an old book, and though it is made up largely of quotations from bishops and saints who lived long ago, *it is the living, present doctrine of the Romish Church in America.* How many editions since the first may have been issued in this country we have no means of knowing, but the reader will bear in mind that this, the first, edition was indorsed and *approved* by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, after having been *duly examined*, as late as the year 1852!

We have not sought to give any regular and formal review of the work. It does not merit it. Its only value to a Christian is in the means it furnishes on every page for exposing the hidden mystery of Romish doctrine. And in this respect it is invaluable.

It is made up, like the portions we have exhibited, of arguments supported by quotations from saints and others, together with monstrous perversions of Holy Scripture, to prove the peculiar and transcendent glories of Mary as "set forth in the great prayer of the *Salve Regina* approved by the Church," interspersed with prayers and devotional exercises "most in use by the servants of Mary, and *approved by the Church.*" It should be added that the work furnishes a contribution to history by informing us that St. Ann was the mother, and St. Joachim the father, of the Virgin. It also treats us with a detailed and circumstantial account of her post-biblical life, of her death, ascension, and coronation. As for the "examples" of *surprising* blessings secured by those who have had recourse to this "*divine* mother," they are exceedingly numerous, but none of these have we thought worthy of transcribing.

In conclusion, we would earnestly advise those of our readers who may have occasion (as who of us may not?) to encounter Catholicism before the people, to procure, if they *possibly can*, a copy of this wonderful book. We assure them that in Father Hecker's works, and others, which are *designed for Protestants*, they will find very little, if any, of the doctrine which is taught here. The "Aspirations of Nature," a work written to make converts to Catholicism, and

professedly stating its doctrine, will be searched in vain for such sentiments as abound every-where in the "Glories of Mary."

We infer, from this fact, that Catholicism is deceiving itself, and, temporarily, deceiving the public, as to its prospective strength in this country. All that is necessary to defeat it is for Protestants to carry out consistently their fundamental and distinctive principles, while they unveil the false prophet and disclose to their fellow-men the hideous visage beneath. *Americans will never accept the doctrines which we have portrayed in this article!* And Rome herself *can* not, because she *dare* not, change them. They are fixed, stereotyped, and unalterable. Secure the book in which they are contained, and hold the Jesuits and their Church to them.

IV.—THE ROYAL PRIESTHOOD.

THE priestly function is not peculiar to any nation or age. Through the mediation of the priest, the human heart has ever intuitively sought to bridge the chasm between the Holy One and fallen man. No effort of genius has ever, or can ever, take from the conscience of humanity the necessity of this mediation. It will not avail the skeptic to say it is a relic of the barbarous ages; for, alike with the roving tribes of Asia, and the ignorant hordes of Africa, the most enlightened minds of Europe and America have felt this truth, and acknowledged its necessity. The false philosophies, sciences, and civilizations of those ages have long since been discarded; but the combined efforts of infidelity, adorned by the greatest genius, and wielding the logic and rhetoric of every age, have only served to deepen this universal conviction.

Whence, then, the priestly office? Human wisdom could not have originated it; but, when once revealed, the necessities of man's fallen nature impelled him, intuitively and forever, to appropriate it. How one sinful creature can become the sanctified and accepted mediator between his fellows and the Just and Holy One is far

beyond the ken of human vision. But when that Holy One, by his own will and ceremonial law, sanctifies to himself a holy priesthood, the heart intuitively accepts it as the divine basis of human redemption, and hence the only hope of a lost and fallen world.

The first intimation of a priesthood that we have in the Word of God is in connection with him whose order was destined to become illustrious throughout the cycles of time. Melchisedec is called "King of Salem, and priest of the most high God"—a royal priest to whom even Abraham paid tithes. Again, in the days of Joseph, we read of Potipherah, priest of On, or Heliopolis, in Egypt; and of the priests generally, as a distinct and greatly-honored class in that country. Afterward, we read of "Jethro, priest of Midian," who so kindly received and entertained the future lawgiver of Israel. During all this period, we find no divine statute consecrating any family or class to the priestly order. Nor was the sacerdotal office reckoned among the rights of primogeniture, as some suppose. These the Scripture itself limits to preëminence among the brethren, and a double portion of the inheritance. (1 Chron. v, 1–4.) In the patriarchal age, while no one was forbid the altar, yet the father, by common consent, and of right, as the head of the family, stood before God and interceded in behalf of his children. As families grew into nations, kings, as national heads, and for the same reasons, sometimes, and especially upon great festive occasions, performed priestly duties. But we are not to conclude, from all this, that God did not signify his choice and divine acceptance of his faithful priests, else, whence the glory and renown of Melchisedec, not only among his own people, but among all the nations of Asia? By his providences, God had marked him as the "blessed of the Lord," "the priest of the most high God." During this dispensation every man could build his own altar, and offer thereon his sacrifices. There was no tabernacle, with its consecrated altar, upon which all sacrifices must be offered. The humble worshiper of God might build his altar upon Ararat, in the grove of Mamre, or in the vale of Shechem, and offer there his sacrifices.

But, in the lapse of time, the tabernacle is spread, and the brazen altar erected. God has chosen a people from among the nations of the earth, and a new order of priesthood must be consecrated, in harmony with the divine economy now established. Jehovah proposed now to dwell in person among his people, to manifest his

presence in the house to be built for him. It was proper that the house in which God should dwell should be built in accordance with his own designs; hence Moses built it exactly after the pattern shown him in the mount. But now that the tabernacle is set up, the glory of God is descended upon it, and his shekinah is within, whose feet shall now tread those sacred precincts, consecrated by the glory of his presence? Evidently only his chosen and consecrated priesthood. Of the twelve tribes, he chose that of Levi to minister to him, and for the people, in sacred things; and, from this tribe, the family of Aaron to officiate in the tabernacle.

It is foreign to our present purpose to institute any inquiry as to the reason of Jehovah's choice. Suffice it to say, that the same God who called Israel from the nations, also called out of Israel this tribe and family, and consecrated them to the priestly office.

To this priestly order, then, as the type of another and more enduring one, we invite attention for a time.

First: *Their qualifications.* The purity, perfection, and holiness of their calling were indicated by all the outward and bodily ceremonies of the law concerning the priesthood. Every thing tended to impress the fact that they were separated from the world—set apart to God. 1st. They were to have no bodily defilements whatever. Only a perfect and unblemished body could stand before the Lord. 2d. They were to serve in the tabernacle only during the strength and vigor of manhood. Neither the feebleness of childhood, nor old age, was tolerated within its holy precincts. 3d. They were to avoid every occasion of bodily defilement, such as contact with the dead, except in cases of near relationship; cutting and disfiguring the beard, as in times of mourning; marrying a woman of bad fame, or one that had been divorced; and the high-priest, as being in his own person the most sacred, was still further restricted, in that he was not to defile himself even for his father and mother, and should marry only a virgin. 4th. Their garments of white linen, promoting cleanliness, as the use of them always does, indicated purity of life; hence, the white garments of the heavenly inhabitants are, in the language of revelation, expressly declared to mean "the righteousness of saints." For this reason, also, the pure white robes worn by the high-priest on the day of atonement are called the "garments of holiness," and upon his miter was written, "Holiness to the Lord."

Second: *The Consecration.* They were taken to the door of the tabernacle, and their bodies washed in the waters of the laver, the priestly garments put upon them, and their heads anointed with oil—the washing in the cleansing element of water again indicating purity of soul and life, and the anointing with oil declaring them to be chosen of God and consecrated to his service. But all these external purifications only served to reveal to them the immeasurable distance between themselves and the Holy One, in whose presence they were about to stand. They were now, in some degree, at least, prepared to comprehend the necessity for the blood of Atonement. This again was provided in such a manner as not only to impress them with its necessity, but also with a vivid consciousness of the absolute purity of those who would serve at the altar of Jehovah. "For first of all there was presented, for the expiation of sin, the bullock of sin-offering, of which nothing save a little fat was offered, (on the altar,) because the offerers were not yet worthy to have any gift or offering accepted by God. But after they had been so far purged, they slew the burnt-offering to God, which was wholly laid upon the altar. And after this came a sacrifice, like a peace-offering, (which was wont to be divided between God, the priest, and the offerers,) showing that they were now so far received into favor with God that they might eat at his table." The blood of the victim was then sprinkled upon the altar and the priest, indicating that God accepted the life (in the blood) of the animal slain, instead of his own; the blood, also, was sprinkled upon his right ear, hand, and foot, consecrating the ear to hear the commands of God, the hand to extend offerings unto him, the foot to tread the holy precincts of his court, and hasten in the ways of his righteousness. Now, to complete the consecration, the oil and blood, commingled, were sprinkled upon him, signifying that their consecrating and cleansing influence would ever be present with him, so long as he obeyed the commandments of God. Thus, every ceremonial act of consecration displays the holiness of the Infinite One, and, at the same time, discovers the woeful depths of human degradation. Here, too, the boundless grace and mercy of God are ever present in the blood of atonement, but only attained through a priesthood consecrated in every respect as the Infinite Father has directed.

Third: *The Duties of the Priesthood.* The tribe of Levi received

no lot with the other tribes, but was wholly consecrated to the work of the Lord. To this tribe, while sojourning in the wilderness, was given in charge the tabernacle. Around it they encamped at night, and bore its various parts when traveling in the day. When, at last, they became located in Judea, it was their duty to prepare all things necessary for the temple worship, and to teach the law to the people, among whom they were located, and by whom they were supported. But to the priests were confined the duties of the sanctuary. They were the mediators between God and the people. Theirs was the duty to offer the various offerings of the ceremonial law, to officiate at the morning and evening sacrifices, and, upon the occasion of all national festivals, to keep in order all things about the temple, and unfold the law to the people. (Lev. x, 11; xxxiii, 10, and Malachi ii, 7.) The high-priest alone entered the most holy place once a year, to make atonement for the sins of the people.

To the most casual observer there are, in the Jewish priesthood, evident imperfections. The high-priest himself needed a mediator. With his people he had sinned, and, like them, he needed a sin-offering. Separated from the people, a priest unto God, and yet himself in need of a priest. Propitiating the Divine favor in behalf of Israel, and yet himself standing in the presence of God, only through the boundless grace of his infinite love. The offerings, too, were equally imperfect. No philosophy, human or divine, can demonstrate how it is possible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins, or how the blood of an innocent victim can propitiate Deity. But these are imperfections that must ever attach to all merely human priesthoods. The Divine Wisdom alone can supply the deficiency. The consciousness of this fact lay hold upon the sweet Psalmist of Israel, when he said: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thy enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent. Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." In this, and other Jewish Scriptures, a new order of priesthood is plainly indicated. Still, strange to say, this pretension to the priestly function is the very rock over which the Jews stumbled when they

crucified the Lord of Glory, and which ever after proved a stumbling-block to many Hebrew Christians.

Against these claims of the Christ, two grave objections presented themselves to the Jewish mind: 1. Coming of Juda's tribe, how can he be a priest of Aaron's order? 2. If not of that order, then his is a new one, and without authority. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, meets these difficulties. He frankly admits that Christ could not belong to the Levitical priesthood; for, "he sprang from Juda, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning the priesthood." (Heb. vii, 14.) Besides, if, on earth, he could not minister at that altar, seeing there is a distinct order appointed by the law, and this order is taken from another tribe, (Heb. viii,) by what right then does he claim to be a priest? By Divine right—the call of God himself, the Apostle replies. "No one takes this honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron also was called. So, also, the Christ did not take upon himself the honor of becoming a high-priest; but he gave him this honor who said to him, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee; as he says, also, in another place, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." (Heb. v, 4–6.) Again: "He is made a priest not according to the law of a fleshly commandment, but according to the power of an endless life. For he testifies thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." (Heb. vii, 16–17.) Again: "He is made such by the oath of the living God, which can not be said of Aaron's order." Thus, from their own Scriptures, he demonstrates the necessity for another order of priesthood. These Scriptures find their fulfillment in Christ, and the order in which he is high-priest.

This new order, while in many particulars it resembles the former, yet, in its essential characteristics, is altogether superior to it. It is a royal priesthood. This high-priest is possessed of power and authority. We no longer listen for the sound of the bells upon his robes to assure us that he lives while standing in the midst of the *shekinah* of God. His is an unchangeable priesthood, and he lives and abides forever to make intercession for the saints.

Made a priest by the "oath of God," and "the power of an endless life," he entered upon his official duties, not because of lineal descent, but because of the eternal fitness of things. In his person the necessary defects of the former priesthood are done away. He

alone of all born of women is spotlessly pure. He alone can stand with unveiled face in the *sanctum sanctorum* of the universe. Sinless, he needs no sin-offering for himself, no priest to stand between him and his Father in heaven. What a glorious high-priest is this—our brother, tempted as we are tempted, and yet without sin; and, also, our Redeemer and King, who lives and abides forever! Nor does he enter the most holy place without the blood of atonement; yet not the blood of bulls and goats, which can not cleanse from sin, but by his own precious blood, shed for the remission of the sins of many. Thus the Divine Wisdom has presented a perfect mediation through the Son of Mary—the Son of God—as human as his mother, as divine as his father—a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec.

Now, since in him we "live, and move, and have our being," and our "life is hid with Christ in God," we, too, are royal priests with him; having been consecrated and brought near to God, "an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ," we are constituted in him "a chosen race, a royal priesthood." Christ "hast redeemed us to God by his blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us to our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth."

To conclude the argument, the apostle declares that to have been simply the type of this, the services of the Jewish tabernacle only "copies" of the things in the heavens. To this typical relation we invite attention for a time:

1. As the people of Israel could approach their God only through the mediation of Aaron and his sons, so now we can only come to God through Jesus the Christ. Thus has God ordained; and the result of Korah's rebellion should teach the Roman priest the infamy of his pretension, and the inevitable doom that awaits him. Christ is the one Mediator, and no man can come to God but through him.

2. The sacrifices, consecrations, garments, purifications by water and blood, were all typical of the personal holiness of Christ, only his was not acquired, but original, inherent holiness. He was the "lamb without spot or blemish," covered from his youth with a spotless garment of righteousness.

3. The high-priest entering the most holy place with the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast, typified Christ entering heaven, bearing his people upon his heart before the throne of God.

4. The clear and perfect revelation of the Father's will was prefigured by the *Urim* and *Thummim* of the Jewish high-priest, "through which the priesthood gave auricular decisions in regard to the things of God." In short, the covenant of Sinai was typical of a better covenant, and all the ceremonies of the tabernacle service "copies of the things in the heavens." (Heb. ix, x.)

5. We conclude, then, with great confidence, that the consecration and anointing of the Aaronic priesthood was typical of the consecration and anointing of the Christian priesthood. It would be strange, indeed, if it were not so. That which preceded and which came after the anointing was typical; then, why not the anointing itself? Indeed, the "various immersions" spoken of by the apostle in this chapter, constitute a part of the consecrating ceremony.

We have already invited attention to the order of consecration peculiar to the Jewish priesthood. They were washed in the laver, their garments put upon them, their heads anointed with oil, the sacrifices offered, and the consecration completed by the blood of sprinkling.

For the fulfillment of all righteousness, whether exhibited in positive commands, or in the shadows of the Law, the body of Christ was washed in the laver of baptism, and the heavens opening, he was anointed Prophet, Priest, and King, by the descending Spirit of God. Unlike Aaron, he needed no sprinkling of blood upon himself. One with the Father, he had no Divine favor to propitiate. Sinless, he had no guilt to cleanse, but with his own blood he entered the most holy place, once for all, to make atonement for the human family. Christ was anointed Priest at his baptism.

Against these conclusions the following objections will be urged:

1. An objection based upon Heb. vii, 11, 17. "If, then, there had been a perfect expiation by means of the Levitical priesthood, (for with reference to it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should be raised up after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? It is evident that, when the priesthood is changed, there is of necessity, also, a change of the law. For He of whom these things are said belongs to another tribe, from which no one attended upon the altar. For it is very clear that our Lord sprung from Juda, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning the priesthood." There can be no valid

objection based upon this passage. Some of the Jewish Christians taught that the law of Moses had not been abrogated, and was therefore binding still upon all the followers of Christ. Paul meets this declaration by pointing to their own Scriptures, which declared that God would raise up a "new order" of priesthood. That Christ was a priest, they themselves acknowledged; but that he could not belong to the Levitical priesthood was evident, for he came from the wrong tribe; but is, rather, a royal priest after the order of Melchisedec. Hence, the priesthood being changed, there is of necessity a change of the law. This is the logical conclusion of the apostle. That he was a priest *then* is conclusively demonstrated. This, and no more, upon that question.

2. Heb. viii, 1–7: "Now, concerning the things that have been spoken, the principal point is this: We have such a high-priest, who has taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the holy places, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high-priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore, it is necessary that this one also have something which he may offer. For if he were on earth, he could not be a priest; because there are priests who offer gifts according to the law: and these serve the copy and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle. See now, says he, that you make all things according to the pattern shown you in the Mount. But now he has obtained a more excellent ministry, inasmuch as he is the Mediator of a better covenant, which is established with reference to better promises."

The apostle, in this context, declares the tabernacle erected by Moses to be "the copy and shadow of heavenly things;" that Christ serves "a minister of the holy places, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." He does not serve in the former, and if he were on earth he could not be a priest in that line and serve in that tabernacle. But why not? Because there are already priests that offer gifts according to the law. This Christ could not do if on earth, for, as we have already seen, he does not come from the right tribe. Hence the conclusion: He has obtained a more excellent ministry, inasmuch as he is the Mediator of a better covenant, which is established with reference to better promises.

This is clearly the logical import of the apostle's argument, and beyond this we can not legitimately press the interpretation.

3. Heb. i, 9: "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." This prophecy the apostle applies directly to the Savior; and, indeed, it is applicable to none other. If it be said that the anointing was a completed event when the prophecy was first uttered, the conclusion is fatal to the objector. If, as it most certainly was, the anointing was yet a future event, then this passage does not throw any light upon the time and place of the anointing, and hence the objection based upon it is invalid.

4. Acts ii, 36: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made this same Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ."

This passage simply forms the conclusion of a grand argument in demonstration of the Messiahship, which the apostle has just completed, but the time and place of the anointing the context does not determine.

5. Finally, it is urged that he did not begin at once to officiate as priest, and could not, until the Jewish sacrifices had ceased. This we readily grant, but the conclusion does not affect the fact that he was anointed priest at his baptism. Time, indeed, elapsed between the anointing and the beginning of his official work, but the Old Testament Scriptures abound in illustrations entirely similar. The Lord sent Elijah from Horeb, on the way to the wilderness of Damascus, to anoint Hazael to be king over Syria; Jehu, the son of Nimshi, to be king over Israel; and Elisha to be prophet in his stead. Elijah faithfully fulfilled the commands of the Lord, but long years supervened before either of these anointed ones began their official work. It was at least seven years after this before Elijah was taken up to heaven, and left his mantle with Elisha; and it was, probably, twice that time before the death of the kings of Syria and Israel gave room for Hazael and Jehu to assume the scepters of their respective kingdoms. Long years of trials, likewise, intervened after the son of Jessie was anointed king, before the shepherd of Bethlehem assumed the royal purple. So with his illustrious antitype, "the Prince of the house of David." He was anointed at his baptism, but three years of bitter trial had passed away when he

began his work as priest; and the rending of the veil indicated the abolishment of the Levitical priesthood.

In confirmation of this proposition we submit the following proofs:

1. Luke iv, 17–21: "And the volume of Isaiah the prophet was given to him: and when he had unrolled the volume, he found the place where it was written: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because he has anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he has sent me to heal the broken-hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives; and recovery of sight to the blind; to set free the oppressed; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . . And he began to say to them: This scripture which you have heard is this day fulfilled."

Here the Master declares himself to be already anointed to do a work which necessarily involved the priestly function. That is, "to heal the broken-hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives; and recovery of sight to the blind; to set free the oppressed;" but without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, no such thing as setting free the oppressed or giving liberty to the captives. Hence, we conclude, with positive certainty, that he had, in this early period of his ministry, been anointed to offer the sacrifice of atonement, to shed his blood for the remission of the sins of many; but only a priest can accomplish this work.

2. Acts x, 36–38: "The word which he sent to the sons of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ, (he is Lord of all,) that word, you know, which was published through the whole of Judea, beginning from Galilee, after the immersion that John preached—how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power." The "word" sent to the sons of Israel, and which was published through the whole of Judea, was that God had anointed Jesus. But where was this word published? It began in Galilee, after John's immersion. Why had it not been proclaimed before? Because God had not before anointed him. Why proclaimed just after John's immersion? Because at his immersion he was anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power. This is absolutely certain, and since there is not a single intimation, in all the book, of any other anointing, we conclude that he was here anointed Prophet, Priest, and King.

3. In his confession, Peter said: "Thou art *the* Anointed, the Son of the living God"—the Prophet, Priest, and King. Thou *art* the Anointed; not will be, but art now. This is simply exhaustive. There can be no other anointed one, no other anointing. "Upon this truth I will build my Church." But if the priestly function constitutes no part of that truth, then his priestly relation constitutes no part of the foundation. Hence we conclude again that he was the anointed priest.

4. "I adjure you by the living God, that you tell us whether you are the Christ, the Son of the living God?" "Jesus said to him: You have said." Under oath he affirmed himself *the* Anointed of God, the Prophet, Priest, and King. This ought to be conclusive.

5. Into the first tabernacle the high-priest went *not*, until he was anointed, and then not without blood. (Heb. ix.) Even so *the Anointed* entered the most holy place, not without the blood of atonement, which he sprinkled upon the mercy-seat. But only the consecrated and anointed priest of God could have offered that spotless lamb, or stood with the "blood of sprinkling" in the presence of the eternal One. We conclude, then, that Christ was anointed priest at his baptism, and began his work as such, when he offered himself upon the cross, and with his own blood entered the heavens to make atonement for the sins of the world.

We have already seen that all the service of the first tabernacle was typical of the service in the true. In the former service the high-priest was washed in the brazen laver, his priestly garments put upon him, his head anointed with oil, and then declared symbolically sanctified by the sprinkling of the blood of atonement. In the true tabernacle services, our great High-Priest was washed in the laver of baptism, and anointed by the Spirit of God descending upon him. He needed no robes of righteousness, for these had ever been around him, nor did he need any sprinkling of the blood of atonement, for sinless he stood in the presence of the universe.

That the washing of the laver was typical of baptism is, we think, demonstrable, if the whole service of the tabernacle was a type of the Christian economy. Altars in that dispensation were typical of altars in this; sacrifices of sacrifices; blood of blood; sprinklings of sprinklings; pourings of pourings; and washings of washings. In that dispensation blood, or its substitute, ashes mingled with water,

was sprinkled upon the parties to be cleansed. Water alone was never sprinkled upon any one by divine authority. So now, in the New Testament, we read of the sprinkling of blood, (Heb. x, 22; xii, 24,) but never of water. There also the blood was poured out upon the altar; even so, the blood of the Redeemer was poured out upon Calvary for the sins of the world. In that economy their bodies were washed wholly in water; so now in this also. In that the oil of anointing was poured on Aaron's head, and ran down upon his beard, even upon his garments; so in this the Holy Spirit was poured out upon Christ without measure, "anointing him with the oil of gladness above his fellows."

Again: that the washing of the laver was typical of baptism is positively affirmed by Dr. Fairbairn, of Glasgow, the greatest of all expounders of Scriptural types. In proof of the proposition he quotes the following (Heb. x, 22): "Having their bodies washed in pure water," "where (he says) the symbolic language is entirely retained." Again (Titus iii, 5): "The washing of regeneration," and (Ephes. v, 26), "Sanctified and cleansed by the washing of water, by the Word."

As Aaron was inducted into the priestly office, so were all the Levitical priests. We also are a "royal priesthood," "kings and priests" with Christ. As he was consecrated and anointed, even so we also should be consecrated.

He was washed—went down into the Jordan, and came up out of it again. We also must be washed. But we, being sinners, must have put on the priestly robes of righteousness, without which we could not officiate at the altar; but "he is our righteousness," hence "as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." In both dispensations the candidate attained to his priestly robes through the washing of the laver, and by baptism respectively.

Again: as in the former service, all things were cleansed by blood, so, in this, "we come to the blood of sprinkling, that speaks better things than the blood of Abel;" but when do we come to this "sprinkling of blood?" Certainly not until we come into the death of Christ. "Know you not that as many of you as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him, by baptism, into death." The Jewish priest passed through the washing of the laver to the sprinkling, we through the

waters of baptism; hence, "draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

Finally, as Christ was anointed with the Holy Spirit after baptism, so we receive the gift of the Holy Spirit after baptism. Christ went down into the Jordan, and came up out of it. The force of his example is deeply felt by the religious world, hence the constant effort made to break it. Christ's baptism, we are told, is no example to us, for, unlike us, he had no sins to be forgiven. True, but he was to become our great high-priest, and this, in harmony with the fulfillment of all righteousness, could not be, unless his body was first washed in the laver of baptism.

Are we, then, consecrated priests? If not, how dare we officiate at the altar? Have our bodies been washed in the laver of baptism? Have we gone down into the tide and come up out of it as did the Savior? If not, let the fate of Korah and his companions be a warning to us. If, in the type, men perished because they approached the altar without consecration, how much greater their punishment in the antitype?

Christ's immersion is, then, indeed, an example to us. Then let me stand, like the blessed Savior, on "Jordan's strand;" yea, let me put my feet in the tracks he left in its yielding sands; like him, lie beneath its liquid wave, and rise with him, a royal "priest forever."

V.—CHRISTOLOGY.

WE beg the reader not to be offended at the heading of this article, if the word be not familiar to his ears. It may, to some, sound a little learned, and even smack a little of vain philosophy, but it is a legitimate word; it has a noble parentage, and has been naturalized in strict accordance with all the statutes in such cases made and provided.

We may be compelled to use, in the discussion we propose, several words which we could wish were more familiar to many of our readers; words which have among us long been under ban, from a misapprehension of their proper meaning, and probably more from a wrong view of the things they signify. Words are signs, and, in order to their correct use, we must regard not only the sign itself, but also the thing signified, and the suitableness of the former to clearly express the latter.

Let no one conclude, from these prefatory remarks, that we are about to talk of words rather than of things; albeit words are things. Not at all; we have no taste for logomachy, and if we had, the subject which for a time is to engage our attention is of such transcendent interest and importance that we can not for a moment think of losing sight of it in the mazes of mere philological disquisition. To give a popular air to what we have to say, we shall use terms in common use, as far as the ideas we wish to bring before the mind can be set forth in language not strictly scientific. The learned reader will appreciate the difficulty of our undertaking, and make, we hope, due allowance for it.

Christology, Theology, Philosophy, are words of pregnant meaning; they stand for realms of thought that may well engage our profoundest attention, and evoke all our power. These themes are connected with our dearest interests for time and eternity. The deep things of revelation, of being, of reason; the problems of divinity and humanity, and the union of these in one glorious person; the conduct of life in its nature, relations, and purposes, and our destiny forever, as redeemed from sin and death, are included, to some

extent, in the clear apprehension of what, in every intelligent mind, is set forth by these words, when properly understood. Whence, then, the prejudice against them—I will not say against the things they signify—that has possessed the minds of many well-meaning people? They sound learned, we admit; but an apology is at hand, and will suggest itself to even the casual reader. Can any other words represent the ideas they stand for as well? We think not. In the sentence which has just dropped from our pen occurs the word *apology*, really not less learned, nor dissimilar in derivation; but it is the best word for our purpose, and we use it without offense. But though Christology, Theology, and Philosophy be learned words, we trust their meaning is known and loved by all who may feel interest enough in them to read this article. The conceptions these words represent relate to the Divinity of our Lord, to God himself, and to the nature of being; and surely these are legitimate subjects of human thought, if entered upon in humble reliance on Divine assistance, diffidence of our own powers, and a supreme respect for the teachings of Holy Scripture.

Certain schools, sacred and secular, have so far speculated upon these noble themes in a dogmatic spirit; and without taking the teachings of the inspired Word into the account, that great confusion of thought, skepticism, and almost all forms of error, have resulted; so that simple minds have been scandalized, and the cause of Christ injured. It has therefore been popular with many to declaim against Philosophy, Theology, and, it may be, even against Christology. Paul himself is gravely cited as condemning Philosophy, without its being noted that it is a vain and empty philosophy that is the object of his condemnation. His censuring of philosophy as it existed in his day—and employed by Greek and Roman sophists on the most puerile questions—could not, without a manifest paralogism, be made to hold against the science that deals with the deepest problems of the human spirit, of reason, and of being; and with the correlation of these according to the formal laws of thought. The same prejudice—*mutatis mutandis*—and for like reasons, is entertained against Theology, natural and revealed; while the fact is, we can not think at all upon the works and words of God without forming to ourselves a theology either true or false; and as we must, if we exercise the God-given prerogative of thought at all, have some

sort of a Christology, Theology, and Philosophy, we take it that we ought to strive to attain the truth in all these departments, so far as may be in our power, and without regard to mere verbal controversy.

It is supposed by many that because Being, Christ, and God are transcendent, that is, in their ultimate ground beyond the reach of the human reason, *à priori*, all inquiries into these great themes are daring and fruitless. But we maintain that while Revelation goes far beyond the reason, and makes known much above, it makes known nothing contrary to the reason; and therefore there is a proper field for the exercise of the latter in formulating the ideas of the former, and thus leading us to a clear apprehension of these Divine verities, confirming our faith, and enabling us to meet the infidel objectors to our holy religion on their own ground.

We lay it down as a proposition susceptible of proof, that a Scriptural Christology is a condition precedent to a reasonable Theology, and that both of these condition a consistent Philosophy. By condition, here, we mean what is strictly such in distinction from what is properly called a cause. "One thing is said to be a condition of another, when its presence and influence are necessary, not that that other may obtain existence and its essential attributes, but that it may unfold and perfect itself according to the laws of its own being."*

Assuming the historic Christ, we contend that any Theology that denies his essential divinity and his incarnation can not commend itself to our reason, but, on the contrary, will, when fairly tested, appear most unreasonable. It may be set forth in most eloquent phrase, and come to us in the garments of taste—may appeal to our love of the esthetical, and even in some degree awaken in us the "enthusiasm of humanity"—but when examined in its ground and essential principles, it will be found false and deceptive. So that now, with men living where the Gospel has been proclaimed, and, in fact, in all lands, the question must be, not between it and another religion, but between it and no religion at all. If Christ be not the second Adam—the generic man—and his religion able to supplant all others, then all religions are founded in error, and are perpetuated by the cunning of the few taking advantage of the credulity of the many. The man who, with a fair presentation of Christ's religion

* See "Gerhard's Philosophy," *passim.*

before him, examines it, weighs its evidences, looks at it as a whole, and tests the consistency of its parts, scrutinizes its spirit and tendency, and then at the bar of reason presents a verdict of "Not proved," is prepared, and is logically required, to reject all religion; nay, more, must reject all reason.

And so, too, in regard to Philosophy, the science of being. Let any man attempt to construct a system which shall ignore the "Word made flesh, and dwelling among us," and he will find himself bewildered in the labyrinths of speculation without end. There will be no consistency in its parts, because there is no plastic principle cementing the whole. Having taken a wrong position—one not central—all his observations, however correctly made, and all his calculations, however exact, will fail to give a true idea of the harmony of the universe. As we can know God only as he is in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, so in Philosophy we can know the world only as viewed in its relation to Him who is its light and life. Christ, then, must correlate on the one side God, in order to a correct theology, and on the other side man, in order to a consistent philosophy. God and man must meet in Christ, in order to a true Christology; and thus he becomes the Theanthropos, whose incarnation complements the demands of our reason in respect to both theology and philosophy.

We said, awhile ago, assuming the historic Christ. But are we allowed logically to do this? Clearly we are. There he is—there are the historic testimonies concerning his birth at a certain time and place—his life of love, his miracles, his teachings, his death, his resurrection, and the mission of the apostles—the new era dating from his birth, the new religion from his death. And the question raises itself in every thoughtful mind, What are we to do with all this? It is not for the believer to worry himself meeting the cavils of unfair opponents, but for these opponents to submit some reasonable hypothesis to account for the origin and wonderful progress of Christianity, against which more and weightier objections do not lie than all that have been or ever can be urged against our faith. Take Jesus of Nazareth, say we, and dispose of him in a way to satisfy the demands of historical criticism. The skeptic has had eighteen centuries for this task—it has never been done, and we are very confident it never will—but till this be done, we are entitled to our

assumption; and it is all we need to a synthesis of our system of Christology.

Philosophy has to deal with Being in its most extended sense—not this or that being, but being in its generic conception. It proposes to answer the What, the Why, and the How of being. It has to do with the abstractions, generalizations, conceptions, judgments, and reasonings pertaining to that mysterious something called being—this is its province, this its problem. Now as God, by Christ, made and now supports, and governs all things which are in heaven, and which are in earth, and which are under the earth, as the Scriptures affirm and Christ's miracles prove, how can a sound philosophy exist, we ask, that does not look to Christ as its first principle?

Theology has to do with the nature and attributes of God, not abstractly, but in his relation to us and the world. What is God? The Scriptures and reason alike respond that no finite mind can comprehend Him—that is, Him the absolute—but Him relatively to us and this creation, both unite harmoniously in declaring to be our Creator, our moral Governor, the Spirit and the Life of all things. They alike demand, in order to a rational conception of Him, the enumeration of those attributes of goodness, wisdom, and power, which, infinite in degree, immutable in essence, and eternal in duration, make up a satisfactory answer to the question, What is God? and without which any other conception must be inadequate in itself, and unsatisfactory to us.

Christology has taken for its initial problem the great question What is the relation of the Divine to the human nature in the person of Christ? This is the question of the ages; it was the question of Christ's age; it is, also, of ours; and it will be of every age till he come to judge the world in righteousness. What think ye of Christ? If there be any thing of which it is emphatically true that history repeats itself, it is in relation to this question, that is made by the Lord himself the foundation of his Church, its creed, and its glory. This settled, and there remains but little about which we may care to dispute in Philosophy, Theology, or Christology.

Let us, then, try to show that the Scripture revelations of Christ are in agreement with the laws of correct thinking in these departments; and in doing this we shall, I think, discover the common unity that pervades them all, and from which each receives its

scientific character and value. We shall find, moreover, that our reason accepts without reluctance the sublime oracle of revelation, "That in Christ all things consist," that he is the alpha and omega of all being, the first and the last, God manifest in flesh.

Philosophy is possible only on the admission of two great intuitions; these are primary truths of the understanding, simple and undefinable, above all proof, and, indeed, supersensual. These are: I am; the world is; the ego and the non-ego—the first constituting the subject, the second the object of thought. The distinction between these is essential, and to hold it fast a condition of all definite and valuable thinking. There is a being that feels, reasons, believes, knows; and there is that which is felt, reasoned, believed and known. The assurance of the reality of both these, and the relation of the one to the other as subject and object, are things of immediate cognition. We need no proof of them; they are necessary, and must be admitted. Men like Berkeley and Hume may raise questions about them, but their theory carried to its last result may be made just as well to invalidate the reality of the mind itself. Can I have any more assurance of the reality of my own mind than of something which is not my mind? Can I make a single step in the analysis of thinking, without the recognition of the fact that what thinks is one entity and the object thought about is another? We call that which thinks, knows, etc., the Reason, using this word comprehensively. It may think about itself, the world, and God. When self is the object of thought, it becomes the thinker and the thing thought, and it is called by logicians a subject-object; the mind has this immediate power of introspection, it can make itself the object of its own thought, but this does not in the least invalidate the philosophical distinction of subject and object, for the mind holds itself in thought just as it holds any thing else, and it is subject to the same laws. In like manner, when I think of the world, or any part thereof, I hold it in the mind according to the laws of thinking, and the same is true when I think of God. To know myself, the world, or God, is to hold these in the reason as they are in themselves; so that we may define "To know" the possessing an object in idea as it is in reality, or, it is the subjective existence of an objective reality. I may know much or little of particular entities, but nothing is knowledge that does not conform to this definition. It embraces as its

elements: 1. Conviction; 2. Of what is true; 3. On sufficient evidence. It is, then, more than faith, and includes it, for faith is conviction, but not necessarily of what is true; it is more than opinion, for that results from insufficient evidence. The grounds of knowledge are sense-perceptions, consciousness, and self-evident propositions.

The knowledge of self embraces two entirely distinct objects. I know I have a mind, and I know I have a body; and I know the one of these just as well as I know the other, for both are essential parts of the self-conscious me, and this is ultimate. I say my mind, my body, and I use these expressions without any hesitation. I never stop to explain, nor does any sane mind require it. But this "my," what of it? For what does it stand? Certainly not for either separately, but for both united in one personality. The argument in that wonderfully acute book, *Butler's Analogy*, for the difference between mind and matter, spirit and body, built upon the expressions my hand, my foot, my body, etc., making the my one thing and the body another, is wholly fallacious, for I can say, with equal propriety, my soul, my spirit, and my body. The fact is, all these make up the my. I am body, soul, and spirit, in one mysterious unity. I know this, but how this is so I know not, and may never know; it may be known only to Him that made me.

Using the word reason to include the soul and the spirit, it is defined by some metaphysicians as "An order of created spirit existing in vital union with a material body."* This is what I know as myself; what I may think or what I may believe in relation to a future or an intermediate state is foreign to this discussion. The reason alone is not the man, neither is the body alone, but both vitally united in one organism. The reason thinks, and it has certain forms in which the matter of its thoughts is held: there is the thing thought of, and the manner of thinking about it; then there is the union of these in the grand product; and this last results from the correspondence between subject and object, or the laws of being and the laws of thinking. Recognizing this duality in the complex being called myself, and that the parts are held in vital union, so that I am not two beings, but one being; and, furthermore, that the union is a condition of the development of each normally; that the reason develops itself through its union with the

* See "Gerhard's Philosophy," *sub voce*,

body, and the body through its union with the reason, in a way we know not, we are prepared to ask how there arises in our mind the conception of God?

Now just here we think philosophy fails, and that theology, properly so called, satisfies the yearnings of our rational nature. That, in its fallen state, unconsciously seeks after God, as all the better writings of the ancients attest. It seeks in the *phanerosis* of nature, in the world which, by the very constitution of the reason, it knows to be beyond itself, for what must ever be the subject of an *apokalupsis*. In a word, it seeks in philosophy for what belongs to theology. The Apostle Paul, in his address to the philosophic Athenians, as reported in Acts, seventeenth chapter, makes all this as lucid as the light: "Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said: Men of Athens, I perceive that in all respects your reverence for demons excels that of other men. For as I was passing through, and looking attentively at the objects of your worship, I discovered also an altar with this inscription: TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore you ignorantly worship, him I make known to you. God, who made the world, and all things that are in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwells not in temples made with hands; nor is he ministered to by the hands of men, as if he needed any thing; for he himself gives to all life, and breath, and all things; and he has made from one blood every nation of men, that they might dwell on all the face of the earth, having marked out their appointed times, and the bounds of their dwelling: that they might seek for God, if perhaps they would feel after him, and find him, although, indeed, he is not far from every one of us. For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as also some of your own poets have said: for we his offspring are."*

We think we have good ground for supposing that, in the normal condition of the reason, Philosophy and Theology would utter but one voice to all men, and that voice would be for one living and true God. Adam doubtless saw in himself and in the kosmos the reflected image of his Maker. As the glassy surface of the clear lake mirrors the cope of heaven with its infinity of stars, or in the light of day reflects from its unruffled plane the image of the glorious sun, but tossed and made turbid by the storm distorts every object above it, so the human reason, agitated by passion and blinded by prejudice,

* Anderson's translation.

no more, as it was wont to do, answers with a true image of God as he appeared before it ere sin had defiled the heart of man. We but express our firm belief when we affirm that the human reason, undisturbed by sin, and in union with its Maker, would *naturally* hold the conception of God even as it holds the conception of self. It is not one of the least effects of transgression that man's reason lost this power of reflecting the image of God. Only a dim remembrance of what it once possessed, and this, more and more obscured as the race was removed from Eden's blessed bowers, remained as a sad memento of his fall.

The first great purpose of revealed religion being to restore to the reason the knowledge of God, and through this to reëstablish the broken relation between God and man, it was to be expected that Revelation should begin with the most sublime oracle ever uttered: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." It is no part of God's intention to tell us *how* he made it, but *who* made it. How superfluous, then, all attempts to reconcile the as yet crude theories of geology with the simple announcement of Moses in the first chapter of Genesis! Our reason demands a Creator for this which itself declares to be a creation; it cries aloud for a God, and even says there is one, but how inadequate, how distorted, how obscure is the conception! Theology relieves Philosophy, and assuming all the latter has truly taught or can teach, it adds to it the knowledge of one living God. It does not, consequently, go over again the ground already won by the reason in the triumphs of philosophy in either physical or metaphysical science. It does not undertake to reveal what may be learned of the world and its laws, or the mind and its operations, by observation and experience. It alludes to these only so far as they come within the proper sphere of religion. Divine wisdom is nowhere more clearly united with infinite love than, having given us the capacity to think, and a universe to think about, and having established the laws according to which we may comprehend the varied relations of part to part and all to Him, he should have ordained that our faculties find employment and pleasure while we study his wonderful works. "The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein. His work is honorable and glorious: and his righteousness endureth forever. He hath made his wonderful works to be remembered; the Lord is

gracious and full of compassion." Revelation is not concerned to make known botany, astronomy, zoölogy, or any branch of natural history; neither does it propose to instruct us in ontology, psychology, or any of the divisions of metaphysical philosophy, but its aim is to make known God to us, because in no other way can he be known as we ought to know him. It is thus that the circle of our knowledge is made complete as far as relates to the Creator and his works. His moral government over men and nations was added, as far as it could be, to the partially-developed reason of the old world, in the communications he made to the patriarchs and prophets, and through the law and its ordinances. The revelation of God, till the coming of our Lord, is properly called theology. Its first principle is, There is one God.

Christology does what neither philosophy nor mere theology could do—it teaches that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Paul says: "There is one God." That is theology, as far as it goes. And he adds, "and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." This latter is Christology. Disobedience to God had disturbed the relations between him, his creature, and his creation; to link again God and man and nature in a blessed bond of peace was the benevolent purpose of Christ's incarnation. He, the *Maker* of all, assumes not the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham, and comes into the world to reconcile all things to himself. The antagonisms aroused by sin are to be overcome; the beautiful harmony of sinless natures is to be restored; the majesty of the divine law is to be vindicated; sin punished; man made holy, and consequently happy; and the disorders introduced into this world remedied. Death is the result of sin. What a change, then, must have been made in humanity and nature when it became active in the bodies of the first transgressors! How worthy the intervention of God; how consonant with the character of Christ to interpose to arrest death, to restore, through redemption, the ruined children of the common Father of all to divine fellowship and eternal life!

To accomplish this a revelation above nature and above the reason of man was needed. Christ is that revelation. From the first appearance of God to Adam, till the glorious visions on Patmos, all the manifestations of Divine wisdom, all the operations of infinite power, all the achievements of boundless love culminate in the Alpha

and Omega, the Beginning and End of the creation of God. He is the organic unity of humanity and divinity, and hence a true idea of both is to be derived from him, and can not be evolved from nature or from reason. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, hath declared him," and thus we know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, which is the beginning of a new life, and that life is eternal.

The great question, then, for us is, What do the Scriptures teach concerning the Christ? We hold that their teaching is in accord with a rational philosophy and theology; not that either of these could of itself suggest or explain the Christological problem, but given the incarnation of Christ, as made known in the New Testament, they both obtain what, without it, they could never have, an ultimate fact unitizing the elements of our knowledge natural and revealed into one consistent whole.

Let it be observed and kept in mind, that in all we have said, we have had no desire to explain either the Divine or the human natures; that would be equally fruitless and impious; but we do aim to show that the union of these in the being we call Christ involves no problem more difficult of conception or belief than those which lie at the foundations of either philosophy or theology. The one correlates the subject and object in a way incomprehensible by our finite faculties; the other the Creator and creation; and Christology does no more with the Divine and human natures in the person of Immanuel, God with us.

Upon close examination it will be found that the errors in philosophy and in theology correspond respectively to the false Christologies that have divided the Church for ages. Heresies in respect to Christ have the same root as errors in philosophizing; indeed, they are the same vicious methods of thought adopted in respect to different subjects; they differ not in form, but in matter. We now propose, with the reader's patience, to show this briefly, and thus close the discussion.

There are four factors to be considered in the solution of the philosophical problem relating to subject and object; there are but four in the solution of the Christological in relation to divinity and humanity in the person of Christ. Dr. Shedd, in his *History of Christian Doctrine*, one of the last and best authorities on the subject,

states these last with great clearness; but he fails to notice their connection with the former. It was not, perhaps, in his plan to do this, and yet it is hardly possible to comprehend the one without the other.

1. The first great system that demands our attention is Realism, a system that has had many and able advocates. It is as old as philosophy itself. Ever since men have formulated their ideas upon the operations of their own minds in this process called thought, Realism has had its troops of defenders. In ancient, as well as in modern times, there have been many schools of Realists, but they have differed only in the application of principles and matters of detail. The ground principle has been held, enunciated, and defended in common. Its fundamental hypothesis is, that all our knowledge is derived from impressions made upon the organs of sense, and reflection upon these. Sensation is every thing; the object, or what is without the mind, is magnified in importance, and the subject, or the mind itself, as far as concerns the acquisition of ideas, or knowledge, is forced into the background; it is merely the plate prepared for the impression, and, through the senses, the objective world photographs itself upon it. The mind's knowledge is determined by the impressions made. In modern times, this school has been greatly divided in opinion, and many modifications of its fundamental doctrine have been proposed, even as far as to reach the representative Idealism of Locke and Leibnitz.

In respect to Christology, we have a sect that corresponds with this philosophical school precisely; as the Realist subordinates, to too great an extent, the object to the subject, the mind to the world, so these exalt the human nature in Christ above the Divine; in some cases even to the exclusion of the Divine altogether, as in pure Arianism. This sect is best known to the student of ecclesiastical history as the Ebionite. At one time it was large and influential. This doctrine has many phases, in writers both ancient and modern; and these, having many names, perplex even diligent readers; but they may be generalized into one class, whose essential feature is that they all deny the Divinity of Christ. They contend he was a creature, and not the Creator; some that he was created before all others and all things, but still he is a *κτίσμα*. The semi-Arians allowed that the Son, or Logos, was of a nature similar to that of God, but not

identical with it; they could not, therefore, attribute divinity to Christ. They recognized in him the *Anthropos*, but not the *Theos*, and consequently could not sincerely say he was the *Theanthropos*. Arian, semi-Arian, Socinian, and Unitarian are all alike in this, that they can not attribute divinity, in its proper sense, to our adorable Redeemer. They admit he was inspired, but an inspired *man*. So were Isaiah, Jeremiah, and all the prophets and apostles, and according to many of our modern Unitarians, so were Shakspeare, Milton, and Byron. The Son of God, say they, is not a subsistence in the essence, but only an effluence from it. From this it follows that, in their view, there can not be in him a union of two natures. The human is all, the divine is nothing. It is easy to be seen that those who were Realists in philosophy, had they turned their attention to the solution of the Christological problem, would have become Ebionites; and, *vice versâ*, those theologians who deny the divinity of Christ are Realists of one school or another, Materialists in some form or other. Locke was a Unitarian, and Priestley a Socinian.

2. The second philosophical school we notice is the Idealist, just the opposite of the former, subjecting, as it does, all things to the mind itself, and even denying, in some of this school, all objective entity whatever. Berkeley and Hume are well-known examples. These show the reactionary tendency of the human mind in such cases. It was Locke's theory of ideas that drove Berkeley to the position that there is nothing real but mind, and this Hume carried to its last result in pure Idealism; nothing exists but the ideas, feelings, and impressions of our own minds. With these men, as well as with the ancient Idealists, the subject was exalted and the object depressed. The reality of the outward was ignored, the conceptions of the mind, if it be not nonsense to so call them, were all the reality that could in the nature of the case be. It is not difficult to reduce the boasted argument of Hume against miracles to a *reductio ad absurdum*, allowing him to be right in his philosophy; for if things exist only in idea, as he maintained, confessedly miracles do so exist, and consequently they have all the reality that any thing can have, even the sophist himself. Miracles, then, on his principles, have all the reality that any thing can have. This may serve to show how self-destructive these partial philosophical systems are. Who ever denies the existence of the subject that thinks, or the object that is thought about, or

who does not give to both the relation they hold in the constitution of nature as given by the Deity, never can have a consistent philosophy. God himself has correlated subject and object, and established the laws of each; therefore, he who thinks as God made him to think, and thinks so as to attain the truth, which is the correspondence of the object in idea to what it is in reality, must recognize the primary importance of both subject and object, and that these are correlates in the laws of thinking.

Gnosticism made the same mistake in respect to Christology that Idealism did in philosophy. It denied the human nature in Christ. He was, said the Gnostic, an *æon*—an emanation from the divine *pleroma*, or fullness. Christ the man was only a phantasm, and therefore there was no Jesus till the immersion in the Jordan, and then only in appearance. He had no objective existence as a man. As the Ebionite admitted the humanity but denied the divinity, the Gnostic admitted the divinity but denied the humanity; each was right and each was wrong, because each was partial. Each was right in his admission and wrong in his denial. Here, as well as in the analogous system of philosophy, there were many shades of opinion, but, as in the one, all meet in a denial of the objectivity and very existence of matter, so all Gnostic sects, from Patripassian to Apollinarian, agreed in a denial of Christ's proper humanity. How sure are men's philosophies to warp their judgments when they forsake the simple declarations of Holy Writ for the vagaries of speculation! The Gnostics questioned the authenticity of all those passages in the New Testament which teach the real existence of the man Jesus, or they gave such an interpretation to them as made them nugatory. With the Gnostic, what could be the meaning of Paul's fine declaration which supplements the theology of the Jew with the assertion of Christ's manhood, thus giving us a saving Christology? "There is one God," says he, "and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." The Jew believed the first of these declarations; the Christian, both; the Gnostic, in reality, neither.

Though many Gnostics conceded the threefold distinction of body, soul, and spirit, even as Paul does in the well-known passage of his in First Thessalonians, "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus

Christ," yet they could not confess that the divine Logos was united to a rational human soul. They lost sight of the human factor in working out this great problem of our redemption through Christ, just as the Unitarianism of the present day loses sight of the Divine.

3. The third general error in philosophy is Absolutism, better known, in its bearing on religious questions, as Pantheism, now fearfully prevalent in Germany and France, and making its way into England and the United States. The central error in this system is that it confounds the distinction between subject and object; it identifies them; the subject is the object, and the object is the subject. The mind is but a function of matter in a certain form. Separate and apart from the brain there is no spirit, no mind. The distinction between matter and mind, say they, is a false distinction, one without a difference, for they are identical. To speak of a distinct entity, called spirit, and most of all, to predicate existence of it either before or after death, is nonsense. Around this pivotal point revolve all the metaphysical wheels and bands of Materialism. Its gospel is, All being is one, and that is matter. It seeks to free itself from the faults of both the preceding systems, and unites subject and object in an ultimate principle, one in essence, differing only in form. This is true of Pantheism, whether we view it in its grosser or more refined forms. The former makes the world God, and God the world; the latter allows an *animus mundi*, and makes that God. It is all the same; God and the world are identified; the nature of mind and the nature of matter is one nature. God and the world are one.

In Christology we have the parallel system in Eutychianism. It asserts the unity of self-consciousness in Christ, but loses sight of the duality of his nature. Eutyches taught, that in the incarnation the human nature was transmuted into the divine, so that the resultant was one person and one nature. He would say God suffered on the cross. As Pantheism in philosophy identified the world with God, thus Eutychianism identified the man Jesus and the infinite God. Its difficulty as a dogmatic system is with all those passages in the Gospels and Epistles that postulate the essential difference between the two natures in the person of Christ, and the subordination of the human to the divine. "My Father is greater than I;" and yet in the Pauline Christology Christ "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Our faith is, he thought right. No system of

faith in Christ can be right that overlooks the fact that he was tempted in all points as we are, but without sin; that he was bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh; that he had a human soul; and that God assumed our nature, sinless as it was in Adam at his creation, but that he did not change it into the divine. He took it into heaven glorified, but it is our nature still. He is clothed with it now, and it is the type of what we shall be when we, too, are glorified in him. Eutychianism is at fault, then, as a system of Christology, because it identifies the divine and human natures.

4. Finally, we have a fourth system of philosophy deserving our notice in this discussion, because it corresponds with the only remaining generic error in regard to Christ. This is Dualism, differing from the three others in this, that, while it avoids their respective errors, it unduly elevates both subject and object. These are held asunder as being in irreconcilable opposition. Each is referred to a principle of its own; hence, it recognizes two absolute principles, and these in antagonism. It admits the object, and that it has real existence; in like manner it admits the subject. Nor does it identify these as do Absolutism and all forms of Materialism, but it opposes the one to the other. There is not one ultimate principle in philosophy, namely, God, without whom, in his unity, no system of the laws of thinking can be self-authenticating; but there are two principles in nature, and these are absolute. There are really two Gods. Like the preceding systems, this divides itself into many forms. It had many disciples in the Orient in ancient times, and it largely influenced the early Church in the days of the Apostles.

Nestorianism is a form of religious thought exactly accordant with this philosophy. It may well be doubted whether or not Nestorius, from whom this heresy derives its name, and who was its great champion, really contended for two Christs, one human, the other divine; but the system itself, as taught by his followers afterward, admitted two natures, but denied their union in one person. With the Nestorian there are two selves held in juxtaposition, so to speak; the acts of each deriving no character from the other. There is no divine humiliation in the incarnation, for the seat of that is in the humanity, and this is not united in a self-conscious Theanthropos; neither is there any exaltation of humanity, for that is in the distinct divinity. Each nature is in marked insulation, and thus Nestorianism

denies the condescension and the exaltation of the one Christ, the humbled and glorified Messiah. The logical conclusion forced upon the Nestorian was, that at the Ascension the humanity was laid aside. The Word made flesh did not take our glorified humanity into heaven.

As each of these four generic forms of error in philosophy denies a fact of consciousness, so each of these four false views of Christ denies a truth of Revelation. There are four, and only four, conditions to a true solution of the initial problem in each sphere. These are, in respect to the philosophical problem:

1. The subject is.
2. The object is.
3. They are essentially different.
4. They are necessarily united in thought.

Of the Christological problem they are:

1. The divine is.
2. The human is.
3. They are essentially different.
4. They are united, not blended, in one person. That person is Christ.

Now, dear reader, what think you of the Christ? Can you, in good faith, say, without equivocation, without reservation—He is "God manifested in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory." If this be not a dear verse to you, be sure you have not yet a Scriptural Christology. The teachings of Scripture relating to this "mystery of godliness" can be harmonized only on the admission of our Savior's essential divinity and humanity. Had we time and space, it would be pleasant to collate the passages in the Old Testament and the New that set our adorable Savior before us in this light; but what need, when we have the radical conception that is found in them all? "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Let our readers keep steadily in their minds the four elements in the Christological problem as we have endeavored to develop them, and while his wonder at the infinite condescension of our Immanuel will not be lessened, but rather increased, and while he will confess himself wholly incompetent to solve the "mystery of mysteries" on principles of human reason, independently of the light that revelation sheds upon

it, his faith will be better prepared to lay hold on Christ without reluctance. He will see that the errors which have been made in the great systems of contradictory and inconsistent philosophy repeat themselves, in man's darkened understanding, when he deserts the utterances of the Holy Spirit concerning the nature of Christ for the fallible speculations of uninspired men.

The press is now teeming with books discussing the question of Christ's life. We are not alarmed at this ; on the contrary, we rather rejoice at the mental activity his strange character awakens in this thinking age. These "Lives of Jesus," no matter by whom written, only confirm us in the conviction that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, have given us the only rational and consistent life of Jesus ; that, till his divinity, his humanity, his miracles, his sacrificial death, and his glorious resurrection, be accepted as they are recorded by these plain men, and as they were universally received by all the disciples in the beginning, he will be an enigma and a paradox, a stumbling-stone and a rock of offense ; certain we are that no hypothesis can be framed, that will satisfy the demands of the reason, to account for the facts connected with the mysterious person of Jesus of Nazareth. We read these books, and acknowledge what merit they possess, but we see in them a value their authors and their admirers would be slow to concede. They all show how futile must be every attempt to account for the phenomena of Christ's life while a controlling and unitizing principle is wanting.

We conclude with the earnest hope that our brethren will not lose sight of the grandeur of the plea which their fathers in the Gospel made for the superlative glory of the Messiahship—that stumbling-block to the Jew, that foolishness to the Greek, but to those who are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. We make this prominent as the foundation of the Church, the bond of our union, and the symbol of our confession. We rest in Him "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

VI.—THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

THE purpose of this article is to answer the following questions:

I. WHAT IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD?

II. WAS THE KINGDOM OF GOD FULLY ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST TO HEAVEN?

III. HAS THE KINGDOM OF GOD YET COME, OR BEEN ESTABLISHED?

Without preliminary or ceremony, let attention be directed to these questions:

I. *What is the kingdom of God?*

That the same is meant by "kingdom of God," "kingdom of Heaven," "His kingdom," and the "kingdom of His dear Son," as a general rule, there can be but little doubt, whether the same is meant in every instance or not. That which is called "His kingdom," (Matt. xvi, 28,) is called "the kingdom of God," (Mark ix, 1, and Luke ix, 27.) The same kingdom mentioned in the phrase, "The Son of Man coming in *his kingdom*," is also mentioned in the phrase, "The *kingdom* of God," for these are two reports of the same speech. The two expressions are simply two designations of the same kingdom. The same, precisely, that is called "The kingdom of Heaven," (Matt. xix, 23,) is called "The kingdom of God," (Mark x, 25.) In Matthew the record is, "That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of Heaven," and in Mark it is, "A rich man to enter into the kingdom of *God*." The "kingdom of Heaven" at hand, as recorded (Matt. iii, 2,) is undoubtedly the same as the "kingdom of God," (Mark i, 14,) for these are two records of the same thing. The same kingdom is meant (Matt. xiii, 11) in the words, "Because to you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of *Heaven*," that is meant, (Mark iv, 11,) "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of *God*." "He that is least in the kingdom of *Heaven* is greater than he," (Matt. xi, 11,) and "He that is least in the kingdom of *God* is greater than he," (Luke

vii, 28,) are simply two records of the same thing, and the same kingdom is meant in both records.

In the following language the phrases "My Church" and "the kingdom of Heaven" are two designations for the same. That which is called "My Church" is called "the kingdom of Heaven." "I say also to you, that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it; and I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (See Matt. xvi, 18, 19.) When we think and speak of what the Lord calls "My Church," we should keep in mind that he calls the same thing, in the same connection, "The kingdom of Heaven," and that he calls the same "My kingdom." (John xviii, 36.) Paul's "general assembly and Church of the First-born," to which he said "We are come," (Heb. xii, 23,) is the same as his "kingdom that can not be moved," verse 28 of the same chapter. It is the same as his "one body," (Eph. iv, 4, and 1 Cor. xii, 13.) All who enter the "one body" at all are immersed into it, or all who enter the kingdom at all, which is the same as entering the "one body," enter it by being born of water and of the Spirit. "Except a man be born again, he can not see (or enjoy) the kingdom of God." (See John iii, 3.) "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (See John iii, 5.) The same community is styled "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth." (1 Tim. iii, 13.) "In Christ," is in the body, Church, or kingdom. To know what the Church is, the body of Christ, the house of God, the temple of God, the building of God, is to know what the kingdom of God is. This view will assist much in ascertaining what the kingdom of God is, and several other things to be investigated in this article.

When we are thinking of the Lord's community as a *body*, we think of the head and the individual members, the life and support of the body. When we think of the same community as a *house*, or family, we immediately think of the head of the family, the members, the discipline and ruling of a family, the care and oversight of a family, the support and dependence of a family, the accession by birth or adoption, whichever figure may be used, and the losses by

death, or those who have abandoned the family. When we think of the same community as a *temple*, or building, we think of the proprietor, foundation, the lively stones built together in it, and the builders. When we think of it as a kingdom, we think of a king, constitution, laws, territory, subjects. When we think of it literally, as the Church, congregation, or community, founded by Christ, the only divinely-founded religious community on earth, we think of God, who authorized it, of the prophets who predicted its founding, with many of its stupendous and momentous surroundings—the Lord Messiah, who founded it, the great truth on which it is built, the authorized apostles and evangelists who first preached the Gospel, called people together, under their new head, in the new community, or the Church, making "one new man." It has Christ for its head, the Gospel—the power of God—to turn the world to God—the teaching of Christ and his apostles for its edification and instruction. Christ is its supreme authority for every thing. His authority is set forth in his own teaching and that of his divinely-authorized and inspired apostles.

The Church, or community of the living God, is composed of members, and has a head, Gospel, teaching, and territory. Bishops, or overseers, and deacons, in their work, are limited to the congregation in their own vicinity, having no jurisdiction in other congregations. The Church of the living God, the body of Christ, or kingdom of God, embraces all the local congregations, with the members, in all the world—all who are truly the people of God. As a whole, it is not an organized body, and has no method of acting in conventional form, in making decrees, laws, or decisions. Its head has made, signed, sealed, and delivered to it *his* laws and decrees, and demands of the Church, or kingdom, implicit obedience. It is not the business of the Church to *make* laws or decrees, but implicitly to *obey* and submit to the laws and decrees made by the Head of the Church.

This community, Church, or kingdom, of which Christ is the head, or king, and all that pertains to it, was embraced in "the eternal purpose of God," but had no existence, in the form of a community, Church, or kingdom, only in the purpose of God for ages. The same that was embodied in the eternal purpose—"a secret," "hid in God"—was subsequently embodied in the promise to Abra-

ham. It was still a secret, a mystery, in a promise of a blessing for all the families of the earth, without any revelation explaining what that blessing was. That promise embraced the Messiah, the Gospel, the Church, and all the attendant blessings for the human race. Still the Church, or kingdom, did not exist in fact, and the blessings were spoken of as "good things *to come*," and not good things *already come*. The same precisely, embodied first in the purpose, and then in the promise of God, subsequently filled a large space in prophecy, but still as "good things to come." Peter has the following comment touching the prophets: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come to you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. To whom it was revealed, that not to themselves, but to us they did minister the things, which are now reported to you by them who have preached the Gospel to you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; into which things the angels desire to look." (See 1 Pet. i, 10, 11, 12.) The kingdom of God is found, first, in the eternal purpose of God, then in the promise of God to Abraham, then in the prophecy, and then in the preaching of John the Immerser. In the preaching of John it is in different form, and a new item comes into the preaching. It is now, "the kingdom of God *at hand*," "the kingdom of God *approaches*," etc. This opens the way for the inquiry—

II. *Was the kingdom of God fully established before the ascension of Christ to heaven?*

This question deserves a very full and satisfactory answer. That the kingdom, or Church, was not fully established, in operation, and doing its work, in the life-time of the Savior, is evident from the following Scriptures and considerations:

1. If the Church, or kingdom, had been established fully, in operation, doing its work, and the apostles not only members of the Church, or citizens of the kingdom, but active agents in it, the apostles and all his disciples, at that time, could not have been so greatly mistaken as they were, and as they remained till they had interviews with the Lord after his resurrection, in reference to the nature of his kingdom. In an interview with the Lord, after he rose from the dead, the disciples said: "Lord, wilt thou at this time

restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (See Acts i, 6.) From this request, it is evident that they were not conscious of his having established a kingdom; that they did not yet understand that his kingdom was to be one "not of this world," but expected a kingdom for Israel, like the one in the time of David or Solomon, and that they were still looking for the kingdom to come. When he died they desponded, supposed his purpose was defeated, and said, "We trusted that it was he who should have redeemed Israel." (See Luke xxiv, 21.) But when he rose, their hope revived that he would redeem Israel from their oppression from the Romans, restore to them their national honors, and be their king; and, in view of this, made the request that he would restore the kingdom to Israel. This shows that they knew nothing about his having already established any kingdom. They certainly, as his ministers, would have known it, had the kingdom been fully established. It was not then established.

2. After the Lord had entered his ministry fully, and was completely before the people, instead of his regarding his kingdom or Church as established, he said, as quoted before to a different point: "On this rock I will build my Church." Did he say, "I *will* build my Church," when he *had* built his Church? In the next verse, (xvi, 19,) he says, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." At this advanced period in the Lord's ministry he was looking into the future for the building of his Church, and the giving of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, or the power to open the Church, to Peter. The Church was not built, and the kingdom not opened, when the Lord uttered this language.

3. The first commission was limited to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." Under this commission the preachers were expressly forbidden to go in the way of the Gentiles. John the Immerser came "preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." (See Matt. iii, 1.) "At hand," did not mean that it *had* come, or that it was *far off*. In the first commission, as recorded Matt. x, 5, 6, 7, the Lord commanded the apostles to "go not in the way of the Gentiles, nor into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as you go, preach, saying, The kingdom of

Heaven is at hand." This was the main theme under the first commission: to call the people to repentance, to immerse them, and prepare them for the near approaching kingdom, or reign of Heaven.

4. In view of the approaching kingdom, or reign of Heaven, the Lord taught his disciples to pray "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." (See Matt. vi, 10.) This corresponds with the preaching. The disciples were commanded to preach that the kingdom was at hand, and to pray for it to come, and that the will of God should be done *on earth* as it is in heaven." He certainly did not teach them to pray "Thy kingdom *come*," after the kingdom *had come.*

5. The Lord said: "Verily I say to you, that there be some of them that stand here, who shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Did the Lord say this when he knew that they had seen the kingdom, and were ministers in it? Surely there can be no good reason for thinking so. They had been preaching that the kingdom was at hand, and praying for it to come, and believed that it would come. They had forsaken their business and followed the Lord. They had preached and prayed, as he told them to do, but did not understand the nature of the main matter involved in their preaching and prayers. They were pressing the Lord for explanations in reference to things which it was not proper to open up yet. They expected pecuniary support, and probably office, or some kind of worldly honors and promotions in the government, which they still kept in view, and frequently became restless and impatient. Such expressions as the one just quoted were intended and calculated to satisfy the disciples and pacify them, without a full explanation of what he did not intend to explain at that time, or that any body should fully understand. It was true that the kingdom had not *then* come, but that some who stood there should not die till they *saw it come.*

6. The explanation that the Lord made before Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," as recorded John xviii, 36, shows that the kingdom was not yet fully established. Pilate inquired, "Are you the king of the Jews?" This question looked to the charge "He is the king of the Jews," which was intended to fasten treasonable purposes on him. Had he been then an established king of the Jews, or of his disciples, with a kingdom fully established and in operation as a

distinct body, in any form, there would certainly have been no difficulty in identifying either the king or the kingdom. He, however, did not deny that he had a kingdom in view, but explained that it was not of this world—that he was no rival of Cæsar; that this kingdom was no rival of the Roman Government, or any other civil government, as it was not of this world, but a heavenly, a spiritual, or a religious institution, entirely distinct from the governments of the world.

7. Beyond all doubt, the kingdom of God, or Church, was not fully established while the apostles, who were the active and effective agents in preaching the Gospel, making disciples, founding churches, setting them in order; advocating, maintaining, and defending the faith, were erring, blundering, and misunderstanding in reference to some of the clearest, most vital, and fundamental matters of the kingdom, or Church; while they did not believe the Lord's own clear statement touching his betrayal into the hands of enemies, his crucifixion, death, and resurrection; while they were doubting and wavering; while they all had their hearts set on an earthly king and kingdom, a mere worldly government; while one of his apostles was a traitor, engaged in a treasonable conspiracy which resulted in the betrayal of his Master, and another, fearing to be identified with his Lord, denied him three times, and uttered bitter oaths; while the account of his resurrection, when reported to the apostles, "seemed to them as idle tales;" while they were all inquiring, "Wilt thou, at this time, restore the kingdom to Israel?" while the Lord, instead of acting in the capacity of the King, High-Priest, filled the place of the suffering, bleeding, and dying victim! Certainly the kingdom was not fully established before the Lord rose from the dead; before he gave the apostles the Great Commission, to "go into all the world"—to "preach the Gospel to every creature;" before he ascended to heaven, "led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men"—"sent the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth;" before the great High-Priest of the Christian profession had gone into the true holy place, of which the holy places on earth were only typical—into heaven itself, with his own blood, to appear in the presence of God for us—to make his one sin-offering in the end of the ages—the only sin-offering that can purge us forever from our sins. To say that the kingdom was fully established at any period while the matters here mentioned were transpiring, is certainly the culmination of all absurdity.

It may be urged, in opposition to this, that the Lord said to some in his time, "The kingdom of God is in you." He certainly did not mean that the kingdom of God was *in the hearts* of those wicked and caviling Jews to whom he spoke. While it is true that the Greek preposition εν, translated "in," literally means *in*, it is equally true that there are places where it should not be rendered *in*. This may be learned from the scope and connection generally. The case in hand is one of that kind. "The kingdom of God is *among* you," instead of *in you;* or *in your midst*, is the true idea. In what sense was the kingdom of God *among* them? In its elements, its incipient or preliminary state; in John the Immerser, the people prepared for the Lord by him; by the apostles, and the seventy whom the Lord sent out under the first commission. It was in the Lord himself, in those whom he sent, and the disciples they were making gradually coming forth, steadily developing itself, being more and more fully unfolded, till its full and complete establishment, in a visible form, on Pentecost.

Here we arrive at a grand culmination, a glorious period, and a full development of what had been preparing, unfolding, and developing regularly but gradually for several years. Here we find the grand change in the apostles. Their erring, blundering, wavering, and misunderstanding ceased. Their timidity, fear to be identified with Jesus, and want of independence ceased. Their ideas of a kingdom of this world at once vanished. Their unbelief terminated. Every man of them becomes bold, independent, and firm as the everlasting hills. No priests, no rabbis; no lawyers, doctors, or philosophers; no jurists, statesmen, or rulers of any sort, now intimidate them. They openly proclaim the Gospel in the face of the world. What they say at the start they say all the time. Not a man of them ever relinquished his ground, departed from or repudiated a truth uttered by any one of them, from this time on. All that was done before this grand change in the apostles was preparatory and preliminary. What was done after this change, was in carrying out their great commission in the new administration. After this period, they were acting under their new commission as the embassadors of the new King; making known the new law using the keys in opening the new kingdom, or Church; bringing light out of darkness, and order out of confusion. A more clearly marked line never was described between

any old and new orders of things, than the one between the state of things before the Holy Spirit came to guide the apostles into all truth, and the state of things after that event. Still, some are doubting whether the kingdom of God has yet come, or is yet established. Others are claiming that their doubts have all been removed—that they are convinced that the kingdom has not come—and are laboring with great zeal to prove this. This opens the way for the third question to be considered in this article:

III. *Has the kingdom of God yet come, or been established?*

To this question the following arguments shall be addressed. The question is not whether "the everlasting kingdom" has come, of which we read, (2 Pet. i, 11;) nor whether the kingdom, "delivered up to God, even the Father," as described by Paul, (1 Cor. xv, 24,) or the kingdom in the glorified state, has come. The question to be considered relates not to the period when all the enemies of the Lord shall have been put under his feet—when the Lord "shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." That the kingdom, in that state, and the time when the King will show this, has not come, all persons of good Bible intelligence will admit. But has the kingdom, in the sense in which John the Immerser speaks of it, when he says, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand," or the kingdom of which John thus speaks, for the coming of which the Lord taught the disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come;" the kingdom to which the Lord referred when he said to Peter, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven;" has this kingdom come? Is the kingdom in existence of which the Lord spoke, when he said, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God"—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God?" Is there any kingdom of Heaven, or of Christ, in existence at this time? Is the Lord Jesus the Christ, King? Has Jesus any reign on earth? Has Messiah any kingdom on earth? It is affirmed in this article that the Messiah is King—that he has a kingdom. The following arguments are offered in proof of this:

1. The first argument offered in support of the position just taken is, that there is no way to account for the change from the first commission to the second, or for the difference between these commissions, only by admitting that the kingdom "at hand," as

preached in the first commission, had come when the apostles commenced preaching under the second. John the Immerser, the Lord, the twelve apostles, and the seventy whom the Lord sent out under the first commission, all preached that the kingdom of Heaven was at hand. Under the last commission they were not commanded to preach, saying, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand." The reason is that the "kingdom at hand," while they were under the first commission, had come when they commenced under the second. They were not simply not commanded to preach, under the second commission, saying, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand," but they never did thus preach. But if the kingdom has not come, was the preaching, saying, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand," true? It was not true that it was *at hand then*, if it has not come yet.

2. The Lord, while the apostles were under the first commission, taught the disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come." This was the grand theme during that period of preaching and prayer. The Lord did not teach them to pray for the kingdom to come after the kingdom had come. There is no account of any holy teacher ever teaching the disciples to pray for the kingdom to come after the Lord ascended to heaven; nor is there an intimation of any one ever praying for the kingdom to come after that event. The reason is, that the kingdom had come.

3. It is perfectly clear, from several Scriptures, that the apostles understood the things proclaimed by John to be at hand all fulfilled when the Church was established on Pentecost. Paul explains to the disciples of John, in Ephesus, that "John truly immersed with the immersion of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe on Him that should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." (See Acts xix, 4.) Here is clearly the general idea that what John preached as "at hand" had actually come; was fulfilled at the time when Paul made this comment. The same is clear from Paul's remarks as recorded Acts xiii, 23, 24. He says, "Of this man's seed has God, according to his promise, raised up to Israel a Savior Jesus; when John had first preached, before His coming, the immersion of repentance to all Israel. And as John fulfilled his course he said, Who think you that I am? I am not he. But, behold, there comes one after me whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to loose." These Scriptures, with other references to John and his immersion, show that

the things by him proclaimed to be at hand, to come, and drawing nigh, were fulfilled, had actually come, when the apostles referred back to them. The central idea in the preaching of John was that the kingdom of God was *at hand.*

4. When the Lord was on trial in the Roman court, Pilate put the question to him, "Are you a king?" Though he was then only prospectively a king, he did not deny being a king, nor of having a kingdom, though it was then in an incipient state, but explained, "My kingdom is not of this world." (See John xviii, 36.) Paul was accused of "saying that there is another king, one Jesus." (See Acts xvii, 7.) There is no intimation, in the whole record, of Paul's correcting this charge, or denying it. If he had not preached that Jesus was a king, he certainly would have denied the charge, or would have explained what he did preach, or Luke would have written out an explanation of their unfounded charge. But the truth is, that he had a kingdom, when he was before Pilate, in its elements, like leaven at work in the meal, like the mustard-seed planted, but not matured—not formed and perfected, but the kingdom *coming.* At the time Paul was charged with preaching that Jesus was a king, the kingdom had come, and the disciples were in the kingdom.

5. The Lord said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Does not that imply, that when a man is born again, he shall see or enjoy the kingdom of God? "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." A man, then, enters the kingdom of God by a birth of water and of the Spirit. When does he enter the kingdom? At the time when he is born of water and of the Spirit, or at some subsequent period? Certainly at the time when he is born of water and of the Spirit. The time when he is born of water and of the Spirit is, literally, the time when he is converted. The time when a man is converted is the time, then, when he enters the kingdom. The kingdom had then come, in the time of the apostles, and the thousands turned to the Lord under their preaching, entered the kingdom of God.

6. Before the kingdom was fully established, and before the door was opened, the Lord said to Peter: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be

loosed in heaven." (See Matt. xvi, 19.) This work also related to the remission of sins, as may be seen by John xx, 23: "Whosever sins you remit, they are remitted to them, and whosever sins you retain, they are retained." This using the keys was to be performed in their divine mission on earth, and in connection with the remission of sins. Certainly Peter did not use the keys of the kingdom of God, in opening the kingdom, when there was no kingdom, or when the kingdom had not come. To use these keys of the kingdom, or to "remit sins," was to open the way to the remission of sins, or to open the kingdom and admit subjects into the new reign. Jesus, as the king, gave to Peter the keys of the kingdom, to use, in his divine mission on earth. This he could not have done if there had been no kingdom on earth in his time. Peter did bind and loose *on earth*, and what he bound and loosed on earth was ratified in heaven. That binding and loosing on earth was in opening the kingdom of God—declaring the terms of remission of sins, *in the time of Peter, on earth.* There was, then, a kingdom on earth, in the time of Peter, to open, and it was a part of his work, in his mission, to open it.

7. Alluding to the same kingdom, in the same conversation, as recorded further on in the same chapter, (Matt. xvi, 28,) after saying to Peter, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom," the Lord said, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom;" or, as reported Mark ix, 1, "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Some have supposed that this had its fulfillment in the mountain of transfiguration. But it can not, with any good reason, be said that the kingdom came there in any sense, or that it was even represented in vision. The King was there shown, and his divine majesty seen as it is now seen in heaven; and three witnesses, Peter, James, and John, were enabled to say, as Peter did, (2 Pet. i, 16, 17, 18,) "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the Excellent Glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice, which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." The King was shown here, in divine majesty, as he would appear in

the near approaching reign, to his eye-witnesses, that they might be able to testify, as Peter did. The promise, in the words, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," or "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power," was not that they should see Jesus, *in divine majesty*, or *the glorified Jesus*, but "see him coming in his kingdom," or "see the kingdom of God come with power." This they did not see in the mountain of transfiguration, but did see before they tasted death. The event described in the second chapter of Acts met and fulfilled not only what the Lord meant when he said, "see the kingdom of God come with power," but what was spoken of by Joel and other prophets. A complete change in the apostles followed the grand and sublime transaction on Pentecost, from wavering to stability, from unbelief to the full assurance of faith, from timidity to boldness, from doubts to certainty; from the first to the second commission, from errors, blunders, and mistakes, to infallible guidance of the Spirit of all truth and all revelation; from the long series of preparatory and preliminary work to the grand culmination, in the kingdom, actually *come in power*, the using of the keys, in opening the kingdom, and the entrance of three thousand souls into the new kingdom.

8. "The seed of the kingdom is the Word of God," and certainly "the seed of the kingdom," "the word of the kingdom," belongs to the period of the existence of the kingdom, and not some period when the kingdom has no existence. The sowing of the seed of the kingdom is preaching the Gospel. The parables of the sower, the leaven in the meal, and several other parables show that the fortunes of the kingdom are in this world; that the tares and the wheat were to grow together, if not in the kingdom, in the same territory, and at the *same time*, and that, at the end of the world, the Lord would send his angels and gather out all things offensive. (Matt. xiii, 26–29.)

9. Paul, speaking of the kingdom of God, as existing in his times, tells what it *is not* and what *it is*. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." (See Rom. xiv, 17.) The apostle proceeds, in the next verse: "For he that in these things serves Christ is acceptable to God." The kingdom of God, of which Paul wrote, was in existence at the time of his writing, and men served Christ in it.

10. The Lord commissioned Paul to preach in the following words: "I have appeared to you for this purpose, to make you a minister and a witness, both of these things which you have seen, and of those things in the which I will appear to you; delivering you from the people and the Gentiles, to whom I now send you, to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified through faith in me." (See Acts xxvi, 16, 17, 18.) This work was to be done under Paul's mission, or during his natural life. Turning, then, from darkness to light was the same as delivering them from the power of darkness. This corresponds with the following language: "Giving thanks to the Father, who has made us fit to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who has delivered us from the power of darkness, and translates us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (See Col. i, 12, 13.) Those whom Paul here includes with himself were turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God—delivered from the power of darkness, and, with Paul, were translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. They were in a kingdom that had then come, that then existed, and not one that had no existence.

11. John the apostle, in addressing the seven Churches in Asia, says: "I John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the island called Patmos, for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." While in this world, John the apostle and those to whom he wrote were *in the kingdom* and patience of Jesus Christ. The kingdom had come, and they were in the kingdom. In this kingdom the Lord Jesus shall reign till he has put all his enemies under his feet, and then he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all.

12. Paul says: "You are come to Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven;" and speaking of the same body further on, he says: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear." (See Heb. xii, 21–28.) They had come to this "Church of the first-born," "general assembly," or "kingdom,"

and were exhorted to serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear, when Paul wrote the letter to the Church in Rome. It has already been shown that the "Church" and "kingdom of God" are two designations for the same institution. To maintain, therefore, that there is no kingdom of God is the same as to maintain that there is no Church of God, no temple of God, no building or house of God, or no body of Christ. It is the same as to deny that there is any "house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth," or that there was any, during the time the apostles were acting under the last commission, *actually existing*. Every reference, during the time the apostles were acting under the last commission, to the Church, the body of Christ, the building of God, the house of God, as then in existence, is a standing refutation of the theory that there is no kingdom of God in existence at this time.

There was, then, a kingdom of God in the time of the apostles. Peter used the keys of the kingdom, opened it; persons "born of water and of the Spirit" entered it; that kingdom is now in existence, and men and women enter into it, and are therefore properly said to be *in the kingdom* and patience of Jesus Christ.

VII.—CHURCH OFFICERS.*

III.—BISHOPS—THEIR DUTIES.

THE duties of the military bishops, or overseers, consisted in obeying the orders of their superior officers, especially of Moses, their commander-in-chief. (Num. xxxi.)

Jerobaal, who is also called Gideon, was a general, and Zebul is called his (ἐπίσκοπος) *bishop* or *overseer*. He was "the ruler of the city." He was the *overseer* and ruler. It was his duty to *oversee* and *rule;* that is, to inspect and govern.

These overseers being under the command of Jehoiada, it was

* See former article, Jan. No., page 117.

their duty to execute his orders, which they did. (2 Kings xi, 15; Sept., 4 Kings xi, 15.) The duties of such as were appointed overseers of the Lord's house, consisted in keeping it in repair and in good order. (V. 18.)

The 928 sons of Benjamin who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon, had Joel, the son of Zichri, for their overseer. He was a civil ruler or overseer, and his duties were of a civil nature. In all cases where the oversight was military, the duties were also military; when the oversight was civil, the duties were also civil; when the oversight related to a house, the duties corresponded with the objects of the oversight.

The duties of ecclesiastical bishops, or overseers, correspond with the interests of the Churches over which such officers were appointed. They were required to (προσέχετε) give attention to themselves, and to all the flock in which (ἐν ᾧ) the Holy Spirit made them overseer, to tend the Church of the Lord, (κυριου, not θεου, Gb. Ln. Tf.,) which he purchased with his own blood. They were also to guard them against "grievous wolves" who would not spare the flock, and men of their own selves who would speak perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Care, attention, and watchfulness were principal duties. The tending of the flock is embraced in the *care* of it. (Acts xx, 28.) Their qualifications, formerly noticed, are the exponents of their duties. No qualification is required for which a duty is contemplated.

IV.—BISHOPS—THEIR AUTHORITY.

Whatever may be the extent of a bishop's authority, it is restricted to the persons and places over which he is appointed an overseer. The bishop or overseer of Jerobaal was "the ruler of the city" of Sechem, and in this capacity he was overseer. He was, then, as bishop, a ruler, and this defines, to some extent, his authority. As bishop of that city, his jurisdiction was confined to its limits, the amount of his authority was measured by the laws of the city. He could make no laws of his own, as he was not a king, but the overseer of another man. He had, however, full authority, and it was his duty to execute all the laws of Sechem; and all the city were bound to obey him. The same is true of all overseers, as it respects their

authority and the obligations of those over whom they are invested with oversight.

We have already shown that overseers and elders in the Church of Christ are the same. They, therefore, have the same authority. Whatever appertains to the one also appertains to the other. The qualifications of a man for the oversight of a Church are to be determined by his family government. (1 Tim. iii, 4.) The good government of his family is shown by the subjection and gravity of his children. These evidences of good government should attend his oversight of a Church; and no member should be retained who refuses to be governed by faithful and competent overseers.

"Let the elders who rule well be counted worthy of double honor," is a divine precept, and it shows, at the same time, the authority of elders and the duty of members. When one rules well, and the others submit, all is right. But when the rule is bad, and there is no submission to the laws of God, all is wrong.

A bishop, or an elder, is an executive officer—not a legislator. Rebellion against him, when he is in the discharge of his official duties, is rebellion against Christ.

The bishops of Rome and her daughters have assumed so much authority, and such extensive jurisdiction, that the office is, by some, regarded as of no authority. In some instances, some Protestants, in their haste to leave Rome behind them, and in the distance, too, have passed Jerusalem without seeing it. Romanists and Episcopalians have made too much of the office—others, too little. In some countries, the office has grown into a bloated aristocracy—in others, it has died of a lean democracy.

DEACONS—WHAT ARE THEY?

The word (*διάκονος*,) from which we get our word deacon, is translated, in the Common Version, *deacon*, three times, *servant*, seven times, and *minister*, twenty times. There is no necessity for this want of uniformity. The word deacon is, in fact, no translation of the word. It means, according to Webster, "a person in the lowest degree of holy orders;" in *Scotland*, "an overseer of the poor, and the master of an incorporated company." The original word is never so used in the New Testament. If we adopt a uniform translation,

minister is the preferable word. There are cases in which servant is admissible.

The idea that a *diakonos* (διάκονος) is a table servant, or a financial officer, is without any foundation. That a *diakonos* did sometimes perform service at table, and also attend to pecuniary matters, is true. But this is not peculiar to him, nor is it exclusively his business; and it is therefore not necessarily to be taken into a definition, or a translation of the word. In every case in which it is translated *deacon*, it should be rendered *minister.*

For the sake of English readers, we will consider all the passages in the New Testament in which the word occurs, and in the order in which they occur:

1. The mother of Zebedee's sons came to Jesus with her two sons, and requested that one of them might sit on his right hand, and the other on his left in his kingdom. This displeased the ten. But Jesus called them to him and said: "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and they who are great exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would become great among you, let him be your (διάκονος) *minister;* and whoever would be first among you, let him be your (δοῦλος) *servant;* even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Matt. xx, 26, 27.

Both the words διάκονος and δοῦλος, which are frequently translated servant, are here used; and a clear distinction is made between them. The man who would become great among them was under the influence of a laudable desire; but he who would be first among them, desired *preëminence*, and therefore he was to be their servant. The Son of Man came not (δουλευω) *to serve*, but (διακονέω) *to minister.* The man who ministers is a minister; he who serves is a servant. Jesus, therefore, was a minister, but not a deacon.

Although the same word is used here which is translated deacon in three instances in the Common Version of the New Testament, yet all will see the impropriety of saying, If any man will become great among you, let him be your deacon.

2. "And the king coming in to view the guests, saw there a man not clothed with a wedding garment; and he says to him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he

was speechless. Then the king said" (τοῖς διακόνοις) *to the ministers*, not (τοῖς δούλοις) *to the servants*, "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him forth into the outer darkness. There will be the weeping and the gnashing of the teeth." (Matt. xxii, 11, 12, 13, 14.) Every person would see the impropriety of translating the word (διάκονοι,) here, *deacons*—making the passage read: And the king said to the *deacons*, etc.

3. "And call not any your father on the earth; for one is your Father, he who is in heaven. Neither be called leaders; for one is your Leader, the Christ. But the greatest of you shall be your (διάκονος) *minister*"—not *deacon*. (Matt. xxiii, 11.)

4. "If any one desires to be first, he shall be last of all, and (διάκονος) minister of all." (Mark ix, 35.)

The case is not as strongly stated here as in Matthew, where (δοῦλος) *servant* is used. But the aspirant was not to become "deacon" of all.

5. The distinction is clearly drawn between (διάκονος) minister and (δοῦλος) servant, in Mark x, 43, 44: "But whoever would become great among you, shall be your minister; and whoever would become chiefest of you, shall be servant of all." Whoever would become great was not to be their deacon, but their minister.

6. "His mother says (τοῖς διακόνοις) to the ministers, Whatever he says to you, do." (John ii, 5.) The ruler of the feast did not know whence the best of the wine was; but his ministers who drew the water knew. These ministers were not deacons, as defined by Webster.

7. "If any one ministers to me, let him follow me; and where I am there shall my (διάκονος) minister be. And if any one ministers to me (ἐμοὶ διακονῇ) him will my father honor." (John xii, 36.) No scholar would think of rendering the passage, There shall my deacon be.

8. In Rom. xiii, 4, the civil ruler is called God's (διάκονος) minister; but not his deacon, table servant, nor financial officer. He was God's minister for good, to those who did good; but his "avenger" to those who did evil.

9. "For I say that Jesus Christ has been more a minister" (διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι,) not a deacon, "of the circumcision, for the sake of God's truth (ἕις) in order to confirm the promises made to the fathers," etc.

10. "I commend to you Phœbe, our sister, who is a (διάκονον) minister of the Church which is in Cenchræa." If this woman was a "deaconess" of the Church referred to, according to this passage, then Jesus Christ was a "deacon" of the circumcision, according to Rom. xv, 8. And if they were "deacons," then Paul and Apollos were not ministers, but "deacons," through whom the Corinthians believed (1 Cor. iii, 5); and God made the apostles able "deacons" (2 Cor. iii, 6); and they commended themselves as God's "deacons," in every thing (2 Cor. vi, 4). Yes, and Satan had his "deacons" also. And if Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, it is not wonderful if his (διάκονοι) "deacons" transform themselves into (διάκονοι) "deacons" of righteousness. (2 Cor. xi, 15.) If this rendering is correct, then Paul says: Are they "deacons" of Christ? (I speak as beside myself.) I am more (2 Cor. xi, 23). And in Gal. ii, 17, he says, "Is Christ, therefore, the deacon of sin?" And in Eph. iii, 7, he affirms that he was made a "deacon" of the Gospel; and in Eph. vi, 21, he says that Tychicus was a faithful deacon in the Lord.

11. "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are in Philippi, with the overseers and (διακόνοις) ministers." (Phil. i, 1.) There is no more reason why the word should be translated "deacons" here than there is for translating it by the same word in all the places in which it is found in all the epistles. It is first assumed that there was an order of men in the Primitive Church called deacons, and then this assumption is made a reason for this rendering of the word. That there was a class of men called ministers is admitted. But there was no class answerable to an order of deacons. The same is true of 1 Tim. iii, 8, 12.

12. Paul calls himself a minister (Col. i, 22, 25), and Epaphras (i, 7), and, also, Tychicus (iv, 7); but no one thinks of calling them deacons. He also tells Timothy, "If thou put the brethren in mind of these things, thou shalt be a good (διάκονος) minister of Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. iv, 6.) Why should the word be translated deacons in chap. iii, 8, 12, and minister in chap. iv, 6? If it should be shown that it may be translated "servant" in some places, this will not justify the translation in any other place, by "deacon." Stricter rules obtain in translation now than in former times.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

1.—*The History of Christianity, from the birth of Christ to the abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire. By* HENRY HART MILMAN, D. D., *Dean of St. Paul's. In three volumes. A new and revised edition.* New York: W. J. Widdleton. 1867. 12mo. pp. 485, 478, 507. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

CHRISTIANITY is both the discord and harmony of history. Forming an integral part of the great struggle of ideas for the last eighteen hundred years, it has proved to be a constant disturbing element in human society, while, at the same time, it has been the only power capable of harmonizing the great conflict of ages, and developing the race to a true civilization.

The very principle of Christianity is aggressive. It is a voice calling the world to a higher and better life. It is a voice, too, terribly in earnest; and it has not failed to make itself heard, though there have been ten thousand voices calling out "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" This fact, in connection with the fact that it is in direct antagonism with the popular traditions and habits of the world, brings on an endless conflict, and is the proper explanation of all the discord it has produced in history.

What it has been, it is to-day.

In those countries where it has been recognized, and its principles practiced, it is a source of peace, harmony, and happiness; but wherever its progress is sternly opposed, it produces discontent, discord, and revolution. And to every reflective man, this is just what might be reasonably expected. Christianity is adapted to the highest interests of men, is intended to bring them into harmony with God and each other; hence, any rejection of it, on the part of men, is a "rejection of the counsel of God against themselves"—a rejection of the only means of human happiness. It must be evident that such madness would carry with it its own punishment. Hence, to study Christianity in its progress in the world, is to study both the wisdom and folly of men. A good history, therefore, on this subject is of incalculable value.

Milman's History has been a standard work for more than twenty years, and this new and revised edition will be hailed with pleasure by all students

of ecclesiastical literature. The three volumes before us cover one of the most important periods in the history of the Church. It is the period of the introduction, first great struggles, triumphs, persecutions, and departures from the simple faith of Christianity.

Situated as we are, at so great distance from that period, it becomes a matter of great importance to us to have a faithful picture of the rise, progress, and corruptions of the Christian religion. The New Testament furnishes us with the historic material for about seventy years, and as this is accessible to all, and is the only reliable history of those years, we are, therefore, not dependent upon human history for the principles and introduction of Christianity. But from the close of the apostolic era, we must look to human sources for all the light we can hope to have thrown upon the struggles of the Church.

Dean Milman traces these struggles through the ten persecutions, giving us a clear *objective* view of the relations of the Church to the world. He is also in a large degree master of the situation, in giving us the *subjective* state of the Church. He carries us, with a masterly skill, through the controversies with the Gnostics, Simonians, Nicolaites, Cerinthians, of the first century; the Basilidians, Carpocratians, Valentinians, Nazareans, Ophites, Patripassians, Artemonites, Montanists, Manicheans, and others, of the second century; the Monarchians, Samosatensians, Noetians, Sabellians, Novatians, etc., of the third century. This *duality* in the history of the Church, that is, its conflicts with the world, and struggles within itself, is an exceedingly important matter, and should receive a careful analysis in any satisfactory ecclesiastical history. And should we ever have a fair, full, and candid history of the period treated by Milman, it will be seen, that in the exact ratio the Church tended toward an alliance with human governments, its inner state, its doctrines, and life became inconsistent, discordant, and fragmentary. True, when the Church was fully established under the secular arm, it was characterized by a sort of mechanical *oneness*, a sort of outside union, but within there was no "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

In reference to this point, we can safely say we have no good Church history. The English historians have been chiefly concerned with the outward relations of the Church. They have, for the most part, treated of its objective history; while the Germans have occupied the other extreme, following, in the main, the line of doctrinal conflict and development which marks the internal or subjective relations of the Church.

Milman is the best English writer of ecclesiastical history, for the reason that he perceives clearly, and discusses with considerable ability, this double relation of that history. There is one point in which he is far from being trustworthy. We refer to his treatment of the rise and progress of Diocesan Episcopacy. Here he evidently allows the weight of his deanship to bear

down the facts of history. We do not say that he falsifies history, but he certainly does not tell the whole truth. The Germans are the only writers who have done this subject justice; and even some of these have failed to perceive with clearness the causes which developed this species of Church government. Planck* has treated the subject with as much ability as any other writer, but he even is sometimes not reliable.

It is obvious to any candid and well-informed student of the New Testament and Ecclesiastical History, that Presbyterianism is not the original form of Church government; nor could it have grown out of the primitive system. Diocesan Episcopacy, however, was easy enough evolved from the simple government of the Apostolic Church. The New Testament teaches that there was a plurality of Bishops over every congregation. But it is easy enough to see that one of these Bishops, on account of his superior tact and influence, might gradually become the chief counselor, and control mainly the affairs of the whole congregation. And it is easy to see, furthermore, that one of these chief Bishops might, in time, come to have a voice in the management of several adjacent churches, which would soon give him an influence that would enable him to usurp authority, and have himself declared the Bishop of a particular Diocese. Hence Diocesan Episcopacy, being simply a perversion of the original government, is the oldest transformation of the Church, in its structure, from the simplicity of its primitive organization.

Presbyterianism is an effort to correct the error of Diocesan Episcopacy. It is the result of a reaction against the outrages of a despotic prelacy. The spirit of the thing was right, but it stopped with a system of Church government as wholly unscriptural, though not so objectionable in many of its features, as the perverted Episcopal form. The only hope of the Church to-day is to abandon both of these systems, and return to the simple apostolic order.

The present is a time full of glorious promise for the future of Christianity. Never before has there been a period when men have studied with more interest the history and fortunes of the Church. Every thing that pertains to the religion of Jesus Christ is receiving a new investigation; and, as this earnest examination proceeds, the old systems are abandoned, the old dogmas are no longer insisted upon, while there is almost every where an earnest desire to know the truth as it came from the lips of Christ and his apostles. Hence just now Church history is doubly interesting. A faithful record of the conflicts, trials, truths, errors, triumphs, and failures of the past, will enable us to work with a more enlightened intelligence in the future.

It is said that human history repeats itself. But this is true only because men will not be guided by the experience of the past. If every one

* Gesch. der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung. Hanov. 1803.

would calmly weigh the facts of history, and seek to make present action correspond to the teaching of that history, we should no longer find humanity going round a circle in its historic evolutions, but, instead thereof, we should behold it moving forward with consistent, steady, and certain steps, toward the highest and noblest civilization.

2.—*The New Testament: translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf, by* GEORGE R. NOYES, D. D., *Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages, and Dexter Lecturer on Biblical Literature in Harvard University.* Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1869. 12mo. pp. viii–570. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

HAVING noticed in the January number of the *Quarterly* the original "*Codex Sinaiticus*," it is with great pleasure that we call the attention of our readers to this translation of the "Greek Text of Tischendorf." Dr. Noyes is already favorably known as a Biblical scholar of high rank, and as a candid, earnest student of the Holy Scriptures. His translation comes to us with a melancholy interest. Although the whole of the MSS. was completed and in the hands of the printer, Death* called the distinguished scholar away from his labors before all the proof-sheets were corrected. This task, however, beginning with the Epistle to the Colossians to the end of the volume, has been faithfully performed by Mr. Ezra Abbot, the Assistant Librarian of Harvard University.

Of the merits of the translation we can not now speak at length. The work has evidently been done with great care, and with a conscientious regard for the exact meaning of the Divine original. Dr. Noyes has succeeded, in a great measure, in what very few translators have done: he has, for the most part, confined himself to the work of a *translator*, and has seldom attempted the business of an *expositor*. This is certainly encouraging, in the very outset of our examination of his work. There are very few translations that are freer from impressions of the theological tenets of the translator than this one. Dr. Noyes was a Unitarian; and, although the Greek text of Tischendorf is supposed to favor somewhat the Unitarian school of theology, it is certain that the Doctor's translation of the Unitarian *proof-texts* is, in the main, true to the original.

We note another recommendation. While the common English version is generally followed wherever there is no special reason for a change, still there is no want of resolution to stick to the requirements of the original when there is a conflict between it and the Common Version. Most versions that have been made upon the basis of the Common Version are not true to the original, or else have such a mixture of old and new style as

* He died June 3, 1868.

to be neither one thing nor the other—a kind of discordant medley of ancient and modern English. We do not say that Dr. Noyes has always steered clear of this difficulty. We think, however, he has done it as well as it can be done by any one who attempts to follow the Common Version at all.

There are some glaring defects, especially in the use of the article, which we hope to notice at considerable length in some future number of the Quarterly. We must content ourselves at present with the quotation of a few passages that have become familiar in theological polemics. We will give the Common Version and Dr. Noyes's translation together, and follow them with the parallel passage from other standard translators, so that our readers may judge of the merits of all:

MATT. XVI, 18.

Common Version: "And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Noyes: "And I, on my part, say to thee, that thou art Peter, a rock, and on this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of the underworld shall not prevail against it."

Dr. George Campbell: "I tell thee likewise, thou art named Rock; and on this rock I will build my Church, over which the gates of Hades shall not prevail."

Wakefield: "And, I say unto thee, thou art truly named Peter; and upon this very stone I will build my Church; and the gates of the grave will not prevail against it."

Thompson: "And, also I say to thee, Thou art Peter, a large stone, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

A. Campbell: "I tell you likewise you are named stone; and on this rock I will build my congregation, over which the gates of Hades shall not prevail."

Bible Union: "And I also say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of the underworld shall not prevail against it."

Anderson: "And I say to you, that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

JOHN III, 8.

Common Version: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Noyes: "The wind bloweth where it will; and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Dr. George Campbell: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh nor whither it goeth: so is every one who is born of the Spirit."

Wakefield: "The breath breathes, in whom it listeth, and thou hearest its voice; but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Thompson: "The Spirit influences where he willeth, and thou hearest his voice, but knowest not whence he cometh nor whither he departeth: so is every one who hath been born of the Spirit."

A. Campbell: "The wind blows where it pleases, and you hear the sound thereof, but know not whence it comes nor whither it goes: so is every one who is born of the Spirit."

Bible Union: "The wind blows where it will, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it comes, nor whither it goes: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Anderson: "The Spirit breathes where he pleases, and you hear his voice, but you know not whence he comes, and whither he goes; so is every one that is begotten of the Spirit."

ACTS II, 38.

Common Version: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Noyes: "But Peter said to them, Repent, and let every one of you be baptized to the name of Jesus Christ, for forgiveness of sins, and ye will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Wakefield: "And Peter said unto them, Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for a remission of sins; and ye will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Thompson: "But Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and let every one of you be baptized for the name of Jesus Christ, unto remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

A. Campbell: "And Peter said to them, Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Hackett: "Then Peter said to them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, upon the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the forgiveness of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Lechler: "But Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, upon the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Bible Union: "And Peter said to them, Repent, and be each of you immersed, upon the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Anderson: "And Peter said to them, Repent, and be immersed every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

I TIM. III, 16.

Common Version: "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Noyes: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness, in him who was manifested in flesh, justified in the spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Wakefield: "And confessedly great is this mystery of godliness, which was manifested in flesh, vindicated by *the* spirit, seen by messengers, proclaimed among Gentiles, believed on in *the* world, taken up into glory."

M'Knight: "For confessedly great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, was justified through the spirit, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Thompson: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

A. Campbell: "And confessedly great is the secret of godliness; he who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of messengers, proclaimed to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, taken up in glory."

Conybeare: "And without contradiction, great is the mystery of godliness—God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit,.beheld by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

Bible Union: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the Gentiles, was believed on in the world, was received up in glory."

Van Oostersee: "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, Who was

manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up to glory."

Anderson: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

We would like to pursue these comparisons further, but we can not do so at present. It would be interesting to notice, not only the differences where the translation is from the same texts, but also the differences on account of the original used. The text of Tischendorf is now conceded to be the best, but it differs in many places from the Common Version text as well as the standard Greek text of Griesbach.

Since the completion of Dr. Noyes's translation, the fifth part of Tischendorf's eighth critical edition of the Greek Testament, extending from Luke xviii, 10, to John vi, 23, has been published. This text differs in some places from that of his "*Synopsis Evangelica*," published in 1864, which was followed by Dr. Noyes in his translation of the Gospels. Mr. Abbot has very properly placed a note at the end of Dr. Noyes's work, indicating the new readings. We note only a few: Luke xiii, 17, omits the verse. John i, 18, reads "only begotten Son" for "only begotten God." John iii, 13, adds, at the end of the verse, "who is in heaven." John iv, 9, omits "for Jews have no dealings with Samaritans."

3.—*The Opium Habit, with Suggestions as to the Remedy.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 335. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

In the late work of M. le Comte de Gobineau on the "*Religions and Philosophies of Central Asia*,"* there is an interesting chapter on Sufism, in which the author alludes to the use of opium and bang as vehicles of religious sentiment, and as exerting a great influence on philosophical speculations. Drunkenness is one of the radical vices of the Orientals. The indolence of the Asiatics seems to breed a fondness for intoxication, and this habit distinctly marks itself on the religions and philosophies of their country.

In some portions of Asia the habit of intemperance prevails to an alarming extent; and that, too, in spite of sumptuary laws and the positive prohibitions of the Koran. Nor is this habit confined to any particular class. Priests as well as princes devote their nights to the wassail-bowl; women and men alike, from the highest to the lowest, spend their evenings in Bacchanalian revels, until, completely mastered by their "cold tea," as brandy is called, they sink down, "dead drunk," on the carpets of the seraglio.

* Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l' Asie Centrale. Par M. le Comte de Gobineau. Deuxième édition. Paris: Didier et Cie., Libraires-Editeurs. 1866. 8vo. pp. 543.

But the Oriental does not use intoxicating beverages because they tickle his palate. It is because of the effect upon the system that he gives himself up to a life of intoxication. Stupefaction of the senses seems to be a condition among Orientals necessary to spiritual enjoyment or intellectual progress. Hence, some of the most eminent Persian scholars seldom spend a night without paying their respects to Bacchus. We have in this fact a psychological phenomenon, which, when understood, will enable us the better to understand Oriental character.

In Europe, the habit of intoxication does not prevail to the same extent as in this country. In the wine-growing regions it is not often you see any one who is thoroughly drunk. The writer of this notice traveled through most of the countries of Europe, and saw but one person who was intoxicated "after our American fashion," and he saw that person in England, where brandy and ale are the principal stimulating beverages used by the people. America ranks with Asia in the habit of drunkenness. But the American is influenced by a very different reason from that which controls the Asiatic. It is not so much because the American is indolent that he becomes intoxicated, as it is because he is too active. Hence we have exemplified, in the habits of the Oriental and American, the old proverb: *Les extrêmes se touchent*—extremes touch each other. Though their mental and physical characteristics are as different as possible, yet their fondness for intoxicating beverages is much the same.

The "Opium Habit" is not so general as the use of intoxicating liquors, but is far more fatal, should it once become fixed. But even this habit is much more common than is generally supposed. It can generally be concealed till the subject is almost beyond the reach of a remedy. Hence any work that will serve to warn the people against this fearful habit, or help to break its spell when once formed, should be hailed with pleasure by all lovers of good society.

Since the publication, in the "London Magazine," for December, 1821, of De Quincey's "Confessions of an English Opium Eater," a knowledge of the ravages of this fearful habit has not been confined to the medical profession. De Quincey's article attracted very considerable attention at the time of its publication. So great, indeed, was the anxiety to read its strange revelations, that the article was speedily published in book form, and had a large sale in both England and this country.

Since the appearance of De Quincey's book, much light has been thrown upon the subject; and it is the purpose of the volume before us to collect the experiences of men who have become subjects of this habit, and point out, as far as possible, the means of escape from it. The first writer in this volume relates the experience of one who ate, in fifteen years, "more than half a hundred weight of opium, equivalent to more

than a hogshead of laudanum." Certainly if a knowledge of the subject of which he writes is any guarantee of fitness for the task he has undertaken, we ought to expect a history of great practical utility from the pen of the author of this leading article. That the compiler has given us a valuable work must be frankly admitted; but we can not help feeling, while reading, it that it ought to have been better.

4.—*The Letters of Madame de Sevigne to her daughter and friends. Edited by* MRS. HALE. Revised edition. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 12mo. pp. 438. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Edited by MRS. HALE. Revised edition. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 12mo. pp. 408. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

IT is generally conceded, we believe, that women are better letter-writers than men. They do not consume time with preliminaries, but take you at once *in medias res*, into the very heart of the matter they propose to discuss. Then, a woman sees a thing quicker than a man; her intuitions are truer, and she is more thoroughly *en rapport* with the world around her. She has also a natural grace, a "*curiosa felicitas*," about her style which is peculiarly adapted to letter-writing. Hence, a volume of letters written by a woman is always much more inviting than a volume written by a man.

The republication, in such an attractive form as the volumes before us, of the letters of Madame de Sévigné and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, will surely be hailed with pleasure by American readers. These letters present us with a picture of one of the most interesting periods in European history, extending from 1655 to 1762. Those of Madame de Sévigné were written during the time when France was at the height of her glory, what the French call their "Augustan Age." The profligate but splendid genius of Louis XIV (who was then the reigning monarch of France) stamped itself upon the whole of European society, and especially upon French society. Never before was there so much wealth, fashion, and pleasure in the French court. In fact, Paris is indebted to that period for whatever of splendor characterizes it to-day.

Madame Sévigné's letters are exceedingly faulty in one respect. Nowhere in them do we find that true female heroism which bravely challenges all encroachments upon virtue. Hence we look in vain for any warnings against the profligacy of the times in which these letters were written. And we can not help suggesting, that while Mrs. Hale was recommending Madame Sévigné as worthy of emulation by American girls, she should have pointed out this seeming defect in the French woman's character. The letters, however, are fine specimens of their kind. They deal with men and things in a manner that is far from being commonplace and prosy.

They are made up of incidents, of conversations, of meetings, of descriptions, and give us at first hand much of the actual life which was then current in France. They are, therefore, in some respects, more interesting and more valuable than a connected history of that remarkable period by some one who was not an actor in it.

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote to her sister thus: "The last pleasure that fell in my way was Madame Sévigné's letters; very pretty they are, but I assert, without the least vanity, that mine will be full as entertaining forty years hence. I advise you, therefore, to put none of them to the use of waste paper." More than a hundred years have now passed away, and we are inclined to think that people generally will conclude, that Lady Mary was at least right in judgment, though she may have been deficient in modesty. Most of her letters were written from the continent, and many of them are of historical value. Those written to her daughter, Lady Bute, give a graphic description of travel, and living pictures of the scenes and persons she met and observed. They show also her deep and earnest attachment to her family, and especially the love she bore to her daughter. While a large portion of her life was spent in the midst of fashionable society, still it is evident, from her letters, that the sweets of domestic peace were far preferable to the gay circles of court life. Although Mrs. Hale thinks her writings are defective in religious feeling, we are compelled to say, nevertheless, that her letters are better reading for American girls than those of Madame Sévigné.

5.—*The Earthly Paradise. A Poem. By* WILLIAM MORRIS. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 430. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE author of this volume was unknown in literary circles until "The Life and Death of Jason" appeared. True, he had published, many years before, a volume of minor poems, but this went into oblivion with a score of other like attempts. Hence, when his "Jason" was published, Mr. William Morris was greeted as a new poet, and his work at once subjected to the severest critical ordeal, in order that the rising star might be properly located in the literary firmament.

The result of this close examination of "Jason" was in Mr. Morris's favor. He at once took high position as a poet. It was, indeed, declared by the critics, that, since the time of Chaucer, there had been no such story told in verse as "Jason."

And now that "The Earthly Paradise" has appeared, Mr. Morris's superior merits as a poet can no longer be questioned. The last poem is in much the same style as the first. It is a story, or rather a succession of stories. It is a number of stories taken alternately from the Greek mythology and the legends of Northern Europe. The plot is happily conceived.

A company of Norsemen, after long and fruitless wanderings up and down the earth in search of a Paradise, at last come to an unknown city of Greek origin, where they are received with great kindness by the inhabitants. This city is "The Earthly Paradise," where they spend their time in a peaceful life, made happy by telling each other, at certain monthly festivals, of

"The gentle music of the by-gone years,"

with which imagination fills the glorious past.

The different stories, linked together in the poem, are simply and beautifully told. Evidently the chief aim of the author is to tell a story, and he surely possesses the highest requisite for this task—an almost exhaustless invention. The magic touch of his genius at once transforms Grecian mythology and Northern tradition into living pictures; and as the story goes on so naturally and quietly, you forget that it is fiction, and become interested in every thing as if it were veritable history.

The Prologue is somewhat tedious, and appears to be needlessly long. But it will bear a second reading, and will improve on acquaintance.

Of the stories, the best are "Atlanta's Race," "Cupid and Psyche," and "Pygmalion;" while the worst is "Ogier the Dane," one of the most improbable stories in modern verse, with scarcely a single redeeming characteristic.

Perhaps there is no more striking example, in the whole range of literature, of the superiority of Grecian mythological stories, as suitable for poetic material, over all others, than is found in "The Earthly Paradise." Northern Europe is certainly rich in legendary lore. Germany is especially fruitful in good mythical stories. Still none of these weave into verse like the mythology of the Greeks and Romans. Hence, when Mr. Morris leaves off the "Story of Cupid and Psyche," "The Love of Alcestis," and "The Son of Crœsus," to tell us of "The Writing on the Image" and "Watching the Falcon," he speaks like one whose inspiration is gone, who has left the sublime regions of poetry, and come down to the lowlands of prose.

Mr. Morris excels in his treatment of the characters of Grecian mythology. His delineations are all characteristic of the Grecian age, and, at the same time, are not distasteful to modern culture. All his characters are chaste; nothing indelicate in the slightest degree is ever allowed to appear.

He is, however, simply a story-teller. He is not a poet of the noblest type. He has genius, but it is the genius of invention. He lacks fire. True poetry must blaze. It is not regulated by objective law; it is a law to itself. One gets tired of reading an author who seems all the while as if he were writing for the critics. A little defiance of criticism is sometimes a fine indication in a poet. It gives evidence that a thinker has been turned loose, and that the old must give way to the new. True genius is not a slave; it knows only to rule. It does not obey laws; it makes laws.

6.—*Search after Truth. Addressed to Young Men. By* GEORGE W. EGLESTON. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 12mo. pp. 267. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE title of this book is certainly inviting. We confess to have opened it with great pleasure. In these days of stirring thought and active investigation, when men are so eager for the acquisition of knowledge as to be not always careful concerning the kind sought, it is quite refreshing to follow an earnest man in search of the truth. And our interest is heightened when we learn that he is a *young* man, and dedicates his book to "The Young Men's Christian Associations of the United States and British Provinces." This much said concerning our prepossessions. We are now frank to say that we were not so deeply interested after we had got fairly into the book. Our appreciation of Mr. Egleston's work was in the exact *inverse* ratio of the amount read. When we read the first sentence: "The progress of young men in moral and spiritual things is mainly dependent on the strength of their confidence in the truth of religion," we were confident that the young man had something valuable to say. And when we came to the following paragraph on the next page, we were sure that we would not be disappointed:

"It is evident, that the more clear and exact the verification of our faith becomes in our mind, the more fully we shall exemplify our religion in our daily life and conduct. Whereas, on the other hand, the more imperfect are our knowledge and grasp of facts which display the truth and importance of religion, the more measured and unsteady will be our regard for its counsels. In the one case, we walk with all the confidence and clearness of men in the light; in the other, our steps are uncertain as those who walk in the glimmering twilight or in the dark."

That talk has the true ring in it, and shows conclusively that the author has a clear conception of the true ground of an earnest religious life. And when he comes to define what faith is, he shows that he is a little in advance of many of the theological schools on that subject.

"When we say 'we believe,' we mean simply, that we are persuaded of the truth of something, whatever the object may be. For instance, if a circumstance were related in our hearing which appeared to be sufficiently credible, or worthy of acceptance, to convince us that the thing stated was really so, we should then be said to 'believe.' To believe, therefore, is, as Bishop Pearson states it, 'an act of the understanding by which we receive, acknowledge, or embrace any thing as a truth.'

"We can not, however, properly be said to believe any thing which is perfectly apparent to the senses; as, for example, when we feel the sensation of pain, or perceive objects which are before our eyes. In all such and similar cases, we do not say, we *believe* we feel pain, or see an object; we always say, we *know*. When any thing is not of itself apparent to the senses, but rather the result of investigation or testimony, then, if we are led to assent to it as true, we are properly said to 'believe.'"

Those are brave words to be uttered by a young man, and addressed to the "Young Men's Christian Associations."

Chapter IV, on the "Holy Scriptures the Basis of our Faith," is well written and, in the main, correct. Some good things are also said in the

chapter on "Religion a Reality," but the interest of the book begins to diminish in the exact ratio of the pages you turn. The chapter on the "Covenant Relation and its Obligations" is intended to show that *infant baptism* is of Divine origin, and that, therefore, all persons baptized in infancy have entered into covenant relationship with Christ, and, as such, should live the Christian life. It is simply a weak argument for a bad cause. We have no heart to give quotations. The next chapter, on the "Holy Spirit's Influence and Power," only increases our conviction that the author ought to have closed his book at the end of the first chapter. He writes a labored article to prove the orthodox view of the Trinity, for which doubtless he ought to receive a unanimous vote of thanks from the "Young Men's Christian Associations in the United States and British Provinces."

7.—*The Gates Ajar. By* ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 12mo. pp. 248. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE writer of this volume is a true woman, and her work is characterized by all the tenderness, delicacy, and pathos of a woman's heart. She has suffered much, and this suffering has prepared her to feel keenly the woes of others. Hence her book is full of consolation for the sorrowing, and will be eagerly read by all who have loved ones "over the River."

Few writers have ever touched more closely on the spirit-land. While following her you often feel as if you were "absent from the body and present with the Lord." But she is sometimes recklessly brave in following a somewhat doubtful philosophy to its ultimate results. That she has gone as far as possible in materializing the occupation of the departed dead, must be apparent to all. There is always a strong temptation, on such themes, to press our inquiries beyond what God has revealed to us, but it is never safe to trust ourselves to such speculations. For, however fascinating they may be, it is better to keep within the bounds of revelation. We must never forget that we "now see through a glass darkly," but after awhile we shall "know even as we are known."

8.—*Providence and Life. Select Sermons preached in the Broadway Church, New York. By* REV. E. H. CHAPIN, D. D. Cincinnati: Williamson & Cantwell. 12mo. pp. 348. 1869.

NEXT to Henry Ward Beecher, Dr. Chapin is, perhaps, the most popular pulpit orator in the United States. And in the elegance of his rhetoric and the massive grandeur of his generalizations, as well as in the impressiveness and beauty of his elocution, he is Mr. Beecher's superior. But his sermons

lack the practical aim, the sharp analysis of men and things, the *kairon gnothi*—the power to perceive and appropriate the present occasion—which characterize the sermons of the Plymouth pulpit orator. Hence Mr. Chapin is not so fully in sympathy with the masses as Mr. Beecher; but his sermons are composed of a finer and more consistent fiber of thought. Mr. Beecher is uneven, sometimes transcendent, but then again almost common-place. But Mr. Chapin, if he does not reach Mr. Beecher's highest points, never sinks to his lowest. Mr. Beecher sparkles, and anon dazzles you with the brilliancy of his thoughts; Mr. Chapin moves on a steady light, shining brighter and brighter to the close of each discourse. Mr. Beecher is the better lecturer, but Mr. Chapin is the better preacher.

This volume contains some of Mr. Chapin's finest sermons, which, bating here and there some denominational tendencies, are worthy to be ranked among the best specimens of sermons in the English language.

9.—*Theological Discussion, held at Des Moines, June* 22, 1868, *between* W. W. King, *Pastor of the Universalist Society of Des Moines, Iowa, and* Alvin I. Hobbs, *Pastor of the Church of Christ, Cherry-Street, Des Moines, Iowa. Reported by* J. L. M'Creery. Des Moines: Mills & Co. 8vo. pp. 247. 1869.

The reports of oral theological discussions are generally unsatisfactory. In fact, the discussions are themselves generally unsatisfactory. Very few men have such perfect command of the whole field of theological polemics and such self-control, as will enable them, in extemporaneous speeches, to present much that is of permanent value to the cause of truth. Hence discussions of this kind, if valuable at all, are chiefly of a transient and local benefit.

This discussion on the merits of Universalism can scarcely lay claim to any very great critical value. It is, however, in merit, fully up to a majority of discussions of its kind, and is a clever exhibition of the present phases of the subject in debate. Had Mr. King been equal to his opponent in talent, learning, and understanding of the real issue, the book would be worth a great deal more than it is. Mr. Hobbs did not have opposition enough to command all his strength. His part of the discussion shows commendable preparation, and is managed with skill and force. But the debate is all on one side, and the consciousness of this makes the reader lose interest in the whole.

We doubt whether it is either wisdom or policy to hold discussions with Universalist preachers. Universalism is simply a *theory*, not a *practical* thing. For, if true, no one is any the better or worse for it; and if false—which it surely is—we think there is a better way to overcome its influence for evil than by quarreling with it.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

10.—*Meister Eckhart, der Mystiker. Zur Geschichte der religiösen Speculation in Deutschland. Von* ADOLF LASSON. Berlin: 1868. (Master Eckhart, the Mystic. A Contribution to the History of Religious Speculation in Germany. By ADOLF LASSON.) 8vo. pp. xx, 354.

WE take great pleasure in calling attention to this book as a really important contribution to the history of thought. Among the forerunners of the Reformation none are more important than the German Mystics of the fourteenth century. Yet, strange to say, up to a very recent period very little accurate information concerning them was to be found. One looks in vain into any extant history of the Church for light in regard to these men. All the "standard" histories, whether German or English, are in the dark here. Neander, who devotes the last section of his history to the "Friends of God," and who dwells with special delight on such phenomena, gives us a confused mass of apparent information in regard to the Mystics and the mystical sects of Germany before the Reformation, out of which it is utterly impossible to gain any clear idea of what they were or wanted. Gieseler, Guericke, Kurz, and Niedner are briefer but not better. Even Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," generally so trustworthy and thorough, is at fault here. Nor are the various histories of philosophy, with a single exception, in their attempts to shed light on the speculation of the earlier German Mystics, any more fortunate. The fourth edition of Gervinus's "*Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*" is the only work published before the year 1857, that contains any thing at all approaching an adequate exhibition and estimate of the opinions and historic position of Eckhart and his disciples. Not until Franz Pfeiffer, in 1857, published his critical edition of the still extant writings of Master Eckhart, was it possible to form any conception of his importance as a thinker, or to appreciate the extent of his influence on his own and later ages. Through the kindness of Pfeiffer, who placed copies of certain manuscripts at his disposal, Gervinus was able (1853) to afford a glimpse into the real character of the man and his work; but it was only a glimpse, after all. In the year 1864, seven years after the publication of Pfeiffer's book, two attempts were made at an exhibition in detail of Eckhart's doctrine, the one by Joseph Bach, Vienna, and the other by R. Heidrich (Posen). It was not, however, until the appearance of the second edition of Ueberweg's "*Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der patristischen und scholastichen Zeit*," (Outline of the History of Philosophy in the Patristic and Scholastic Period,) in 1866, that we were in possession of any thing even measurably satisfactory. This edition of Ueberweg's excellent manual (which ought to

be translated into English) was enriched by a section on "German Mysticism in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," written by Dr. Lasson, who has now given us the full and rich result of his labors in the work before us.

Now, for the first time, we see what Eckhart really was, and in what relation he stood to the Mystics contemporary with him, and to those who succeeded him. Before Schmidt's paper in the "Studien and Kritiken" for 1839, it was even common to regard him as the disciple of Tauler, from the simple fact that few of his writings were known, *as such*, except the discourses which were appended to the Basle edition of Tauler's sermons. Many others were in print, but under Tauler's, Rusbroek's, and Suso's name. Schmidt was convinced that both Tauler and Suso were disciples of Eckhart; even the little he knew of Eckhart was sufficient to make this clear to him. But after Pfeiffer had disclosed the treasures of Eckhart's mind, there was no longer any room for doubt. It only needed that a man should come and place the scattered fragments of the gigantic system in local proximity, in order to show us that this Dominican monk was, among the Mystics, without a rival in the field of thought. This Dr. Lasson has done for us; and we now see what beggars your Taulers and Susos were, in comparison with this Crœsus, at whose groaning tables they were fed. But we will leave him for the present. Perhaps, at some future day, we shall attempt to show our readers more in detail what Eckhart was.

11.—*Israel und die Kirche. Geschichtlicher Ueberblick der Bekehrungen der Juden zum Christenthum in allen Jahrhunderten. Von* CHR. K. KALKAR, *D. Theol. Uebersetzt von* A. MICHELSEN. Hamburg, Agentur des Rauhen Hauses. 1869. (Israel and the Church. Historical View of the Conversions of the Jews to Christianity in all centuries. By CHR. K. KALKAR, Dr. Theol. Translated by A. MICHELSEN.) 8vo.

THERE are very good reasons why this book should be welcomed and appreciated. There is, in the first place, yet a very remarkable ignorance prevalent among Christians generally, (more particularly in some Christian countries,) about the history of the Jews since the Christian era. It is scarcely in place here to inquire why this is so. This ignorance, however, is a reproach both to Christians and to the Jews. The history of the Hebrew race, since their final dispersion from Jerusalem, after the fall of the city, has been one of the most extraordinary in the world's annals. It spreads over the whole earth; not only among civilized, but even among barbarous nations, this wonderful people scattered themselves, lived, often acted a prominent part, and flourished. The Hebrews in their long exile have not been ciphers in the history of nations. In the East, their first home, and in the West, in the North and in the South, they have, through

the ages, made their mark, and become prominent in many of the most eminent paths of human activity. They have taken part in the government of nations, in diplomacy, in finance, commerce, in learning, and in the arts. The martyr history, also, of this people, smitten of God for their great guilt, is a page in history that it would be good for men to know. Christians and Jews are both to blame for the obscurity that yet so largely rests in the general mind over Jewish history since Christ. The dark prejudice against the Jews, but very lately, comparatively, beginning to give way before a more enlightened judgment and charity, prevented Christians from interesting themselves in making the laborious researches necessary to trace truthfully their strange history. The Jews, isolated in mind, in heart, and position within themselves, despised and degraded, bereft of ambition, felt but little motive to collect from the historical treasures scattered among them, and in the archives of the nations, and give freely to the world an account of themselves for the last eighteen centuries. Something has been done in this direction on both sides; but it has been comparatively little. Let a man go through our largest bookstores, and look for good books on this subject, he will seldom find any thing at all. Any thing, therefore, that throws light on any part of this later Jewish history is welcome.

But, in the second place, this book is valuable, because it touches a question of both doubt and interest to Christians, and that is, the receptivity of Jews for Christianity. Few know, and very few believe that, since the primitive Church, Israelites have to any notable extent gone over to a profession of Christianity. This book does much to correct this. Conscientiously and toilsomely Dr. Kalkar has studied this part of Jewish history from the sources themselves. His book embraces the conversions of the Jews in all the countries of Europe, from the centuries past up to our own day. The result will surprise many. To refer only to some of the facts and figures given of the conversions in our own day: Within forty years, in a single province of Prussia, (Silesia,) six thousand Jews embraced Christianity. In Berlin there are at present twenty-five hundred Jewish converts.

An eminent German writer has stated that the number of Jewish converts in our day is proportionately greater than that of Pagan converts.

Both Jews and Christians are disposed often to speak disparagingly of Jewish conversions, as if they were only mercenary. That this may, to a greater or less extent, be true, we are not prepared to deny. But from what we do know of many cases, we are far from sharing the opinion of those who have no faith in Jewish conversions. Such prominent and illustrious names as De Lyra, Tremellius, Cappadose, Da Costa, and Neander, and many others, with whose wonderful history we are familiar, gives us a high appreciation of the deep genuineness of Jewish conversions. There is no man in Holland to-day more devoted in his love to Christ than Dr. Cappadose, and

the name of Neander alone should make men speak with respect of Jewish Christians. We must never forget that not only the Son of God, according to the flesh, but Paul, and Peter, and James, and John, and of old, Moses and David, were Jews. And we add, in the full consciousness of truth, that many of the noblest men within the bounds of Christendom to-day are Jews. Let Israel, with all its sins, not be forgotten.

12.—*Evangelischer Kalender. Jahrbuch für* 1869. *Herausgegeben von* PROF. DR. FERDINAND PIPER. *Zwanzigster Jahrgang.* Berlin, Wiegandt und Grieben. (Evangelical Almanac. Year-book for 1869. Edited by Prof. DR. FERDINAND PIPER. Twentieth Year.) 8vo. pp. 227.

THIS is one of the most valuable and esteemed of the German religious year-books. The Almanac is the smallest part of it. It is a volume of 227 pages, richly filled with the productions of men of learning and talent, a class to which Dr. Piper himself belongs, who is one of the chief contributors. The leading and heaviest article is usually from his pen. Many of the first religious writers of Germany have enriched the pages of this annual for the twenty years of its existence. In the present number there are articles, among others, from such men as Ahlfeld, Fromann, Heppe, Krafft, Ranke, Plitt, Lechler, Otto, and Krummacher. His contribution to this *Almanac* is the last literary gift of Dr. Krummacher to the German people. It is a touching, eloquent sketch of the noble French Protestant preacher, Dionysius Peloquin. The writers for this year-book represent the whole of Germany and German France—the Alsace, which latter is represented by Prof Dr. Schmidt, of Strasbourg.

The entire contents of Piper's Almanac are of a religious character. They are divided generally into two divisions: Mixed articles, and Life-pictures. Under the former we have valuable contributions, generally, on some subject of Christian antiquities. These are always weighty, learned articles. This is represented, the present year, by a very elaborate exhibition, covering forty-seven pages, of the sayings or proverbs of the Wise Men of classical antiquity, and their use in the Church. First, we have the Greeks, (Homer, Hesiod,) and the quotations from these found in the later poets and philosophers of Greece; then these Greek poets and philosophers themselves. Secondly, come the Romans and their great writers and poets. The "sayings" are such as bear on the ethical and religious life and character of men, that reveal the moral and religious current of these heathen nations; and that were afterward, as by Paul, used by Christians in their conflicts with Paganism. This article, by Dr. Piper, is highly instructive.

The main body of the book is filled with the Life-pictures. These are short, but otherwise full, sketches of the lives of men notable in the history

of the Church, representing every period and every country where Christianity has been, and in harmony with the title of the book, selecting generally those lives that have had an *evangelical* character. In the present volume we have men of the ancient Church, of the Middle Ages, the Reformation period, and the period after the Reformation; and of countries represented we have Syria, Italy, France, England, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, America, and the South Sea Islands. These sketches or pictures are written in fine literary style, with deep religious earnestness, and a true spiritual, evangelical unction, that makes it most delightful and profitable to read them. Among others of these short biographies, we have, of the after-Reformation period, those of William of Orange, Gustavus Adolphus, Paul Rabaut, the famous French preacher of the desert, our own David Zeisberger, the Moravian missionary to the Indians, and John Williams, the apostle to the South Sea.

13.—*Deutsches Woerterbuch von* JACOB GRIMM *und* WILHELM GRIMM, *fortgesetzt von* DR. RUDOLF HILDEBRAND *und* DR. KARL WEIGAND. *Vierter Band, zweite Abtheilung, Erste Lieferung. H. Bearbeitet von* DR. MORIZ HEYNE. *Fuenfter Band, achte Lieferung. Kommend—Krachen. Bearbeitet von* DR. R. HILDEBRAND. Leipzig: 1868. (German Dictionary, by JACOB GRIMM and WILHELM GRIMM, continued by DR. RUDOLPH HILDEBRAND and DR. KARL WEIGAND. Fourth Volume, Second Division, First Part. H. By DR. MORIZ HEYNE. Fifth Volume, Eighth Part. K. By DR. R. HILDEBRAND.) 8vo. pp. 239–239.

THIS dictionary, the most extensive and thorough perhaps in any language, originated with the brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, who doubtless stood at the head of German philologists of the past and of the present. They both lived to a high and vigorous old age, and by making their mother-tongue a life-long study, shunning to this end no labor and no expense, and enjoying the fullest advantages of a thorough, widely-expanded philological culture in ancient and modern languages generally, especially in the Teutonic tongues and those kindred to them, they were eminently fitted to undertake, in their riper years, a work like this for their nation, a wonderful monument of learning, of research, study, and labor. These two brothers (the Castor and Pollux of German scholars) coöperated to the latest day of their common life most harmoniously in their common pursuits of love; for their literary works were really to them labors of love. They had long matured the idea of this great treasure-house of the German language; and when they had well prepared the immense mass of materials, they set themselves to work. For some time part after part of the dictionary appeared, the work of their mutual labors. Then one suddenly died, and not very long after him his brother. The work was only begun. It was finally decided that so great an enterprise should not fail; it was due to the great

men who had conceived it as a monument and a peerless treasure to the father-land, that the literary piety of Germany should carry the work forward. To Dr. Hildebrand and Dr. Weigand was assigned the task for the present of continuing and directing it; and while we may well feel that the great hand of the fathers is no longer here, yet it is evident that the work has not fallen into incompetent hands.

The dictionary is printed not in German but in Latin type, to make it more readable to those unfamiliar with the German letters. The definitions are always first given in Latin, when possible, as the meaning of the Latin word is fixed and well known. The word is then compared with kindred words or its equivalents, also, in other tongues. Its history is then traced from its earliest known occurrence in the German language, age after age, onward, marking its forms, and illustrating it by chronologically successive quotations; and finally its present meaning or meanings are illustrated, verified, and fixed by ample citations from the classic German writers.

As an evidence of the amount of labor spent in this dictionary on words, we refer to the space occupied by some of them. The dictionary is in two columns to the page, small type, and the page of large octavo form. The word *haben* alone occupies sixteen, and the word *koenig*, five, of these pages.

The work has proceeded as far as into the letter K, and this already is in the fifth volume. It will no doubt yet take a number of years to complete the whole; but when finally done, if continued to the end as its progress has been thus far, the Germans will have a dictionary of which they may well be proud.

14.—*Juedisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu. Fuenf Vortraege im Leipziger Juenglingsverein, gehalten im Winter* 1867-68, *von* FRANZ DELITZSCH. Erlangen, 1869. (Jewish Artisan-life at the time of Jesus. Five Lectures delivered before the Leipsic Society of Young Men, in the Winter of 1867 and '68, by FRANZ DELITZSCH.) 8vo. pp. 81.

THE name of the author is itself a sufficient guarantee of the solid worth of this book. Delitzsch has already an enviable name for his Biblical erudition; and what he has contributed on the Old Testament belongs to the best we have in that field. His life-long study of all that appertains in language, history, and ancient Jewish works, to the Old Testament and its elucidation, fits him admirably to teach us ancient Jewish life, that is not only interesting in itself, but throws also much light on the New Testament Scriptures.

The topics of the five lectures are:

First Lecture.—The reign of the Herods, and the Second Temple. Second.—View of Labor and Trades, (or artisan-life,) of that period. Third.—Higher and lower rank of the various trades. Fourth.—A June-

day in Jerusalem, in the last decade before Christ. The fifth treats of the union of the artisan and the teacher in the same persons.

All that appertains to the public and private, civil and religious life in Jerusalem, and among the Jews of the period immediately before and at the advent of Christ, is here in attractive and instructive pictures, with dramatic effect, brought before us. It leaves the agreeable conviction in the mind, (well sustained also by the entire history of the Jews in the Bible,) that the Hebrews were once, in their own land and in their palmy, proud days, a very industrious people, devoted to all sorts of honorable labor, to agriculture, handicrafts, architecture, etc., and that in their power of invention in the useful arts they had no mean position among the cultivated nations. It was a conviction and general custom among the Jews of that day, that every man, however well-born and rich, or whatever his other attainments and pursuits, should master a trade. Labor was highly honored among them. So Paul was an artisan, and in his life illustrated the wisdom of giving, among the better classes, a trade to the youth. Nowhere was the *practical wisdom* of human life ever so fully brought out and perfected, in maxim and life, as among the Hebrews. Hence the *Wisdom-literature* (as it is technically called) of the canonical and uncanonical Jewish books is so extensive and so rich; the world has really nothing to compare with it. The dignity of labor is the fruit of the teaching of the Old Testament; and the sublime fact that the Jewish (the Biblical) Messiah was a carpenter, has stamped upon labor the seal of Divine approbation and nobility.

The poor "Wandering Jew," the banished exile of ages, has been driven generally to the only resource his condition left open to him, to traffic in merchandise and money; and the unwholesome influence of a general national devotion to this, and a separation from agricultural, mechanical, and other honorable labor, has told fearfully on this wonderful race. But so it would and will on any other. But wherever the Jew has had for a considerable time a firm position and free opportunities, he has shown, in our day, an aptitude and readiness for the artisan's life, and for the higher and nobler pursuits of human mind, for learning and the arts.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

1.—*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1869. *Erstes Heft.*

Prof. Dr. Ehrenfeuchter opens the new year of this periodical with a very readable and, in some respects, quite valuable article on "Secular and Sacred Eloquence." It is in reality a discussion of the relation of the sermon to the rules of rhetoric applicable to other forms of public speaking. The article begins with a sketch of the development of the various species

of artistic eloquence among the ancient Greeks, the laws of which were finally codified by Aristotle and essentially reproduced by Cicero and Quinctilian. This is followed by an attempt to fix the origin and essence of distinctively religious eloquence, and this by an excellent illustration of the genesis of a sermon, which is full of fine practical suggestions. One of Dr. Ehrenfeuchter's remarks strikes us as peculiarly apt, and worthy of being taken to heart by many of our modern preachers. After the sermon has been written, either in full or merely in outline, he says: "The last step still remains to be taken, to make the fully-formed sermon audible in the congregation! Not until then does it attain similarity to the original Word of God, and only thus does it become a true reproduction of that Word. *A sermon is the sounding voice of the Gospel.* No preacher should say that his sermon is done, as inconsiderate habit so often leads men to say, before it has been poured out of a full heart over his lips." Finally, after having followed the sermon from the first embryonic stage up to its perfect and sonorous form, the author proceeds to determine its place in relation to rhetoric in general. He regards it as the highest form, the transfiguration, of eloquence.

The next article is a continuation of Dr. Köstlin's "Studies concerning the Moral Law," which is followed by two addresses in memory of Schleiermacher, delivered on his centennial birthday, the one at the University of Göttingen by Dr. L. Duncker, and the other at the University of Tübingen by Prof. Sigwart. Dr. Steitz, of Frankfort, brings up the rear with a defense of his position, taken in a former article, in regard to "John the Apostle and John the Presbyter."

2.—*Der Katholik. Zeitschrift für katholische Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben.* December, 1868. January, 1869.

The December number of "The Catholic" contains the conclusion of the article on the "Blood-phials of the Catacombs," the first installment of which we noticed in the *Quarterly* for January. The only other noticeable article is one on "Cardinal Herzan and others of Joseph the Second's Court-theologians." As might be expected, the writer has dipped his pen in the bitterest gall. The very name of Joseph II is enough to make the hair of any man of ultramontane principles stand on end; and, of course, those Catholic theologians and ecclesiastical dignitaries, who were favorable to his reforms, and assisted him in carrying them out, are the objects of the most intense hatred.

The January number opens with an article on the coming "Œcumenical Council," which is a model of that Jesuitical jugglery which it would be a perversion of language to call reasoning. The thesis of the writer is, that the General Councils of the Church have always succeeded in what they

undertook, and that history proves it. He says: "It can be shown that all the great problems of the Church have been solved by General Councils with never-failing success." He admits that, in the Middle Ages, "the adversary" struck "five heavy blows at the kingdom of Christ" (=the Romish Church), two in the Orient, and three in the Occident. In the East, Mohammedanism and the Greek schism arose; in the West, the conflict between the Papacy and the Empire, the countless sects of the Middle Ages, and the great western schism, which ended in the Reformation. Well, the second, third, and fourth Lateran condemned all sorts of heresies; the first Council of Lyons was held for the purpose of calling forth the Crusades; the second Council of Lyons proposed to reunite the Greek and Latin Churches; the first Lateran and the first Lugdunense maintained the power of the Church over against that of the Empire; the Council of Constance sought to nip the Reformation in the bud, and that of Trent to render it of non-effect. The historian stands and asks, Were the heresies rooted out? was Mohammedanism destroyed? were the Greek and Latin Churches united? did the Church succeed in conquering the secular power? and was the Reformation overcome, is there no "schism" any more, are we all within the pale of the mother Church? If so, what is the use of convoking Vaticanum No. I, and inviting us all to come back?

Letting the Œcumenical Council go for what it is worth, we would call attention to an interesting article on the meaning of the slap on the cheek at confirmation, and to the continuation of the series on "Italian Philosophy at the Present Day."

3.—*Revue Chretienne. Paris.* 1869. *January and February.*

These two numbers of the "Christian Review" are rich in matter. In the first, we have the first of the two articles, promised by M. Ernest Naville, on "The Adversaries of Philosophy." He divides the modern adversaries of philosophy into two classes. "The first class declares the exercise of the intellect to be pernicious, and invites men to accept, without examination, the doctrines presented to him by tradition. This is the view which Abbé de Lamennais developed with the most brilliant talent and the most vehement passion. The other class accords to the intellect the right and the power to coördinate the facts of experience, and thus to establish a certain number of particular sciences, but it rejects, as chimerical, the pretension of discovering, beyond experience, the cause, the ground, of the existence of these facts, and of rising to the consideration of a primitive unity, from which all things proceed." The first class the writer dispatches with a few words, as having but little weight in the controversies of the present day, and then turns the whole power of his intellectual artillery on the second, which is

composed, of course, of Positivists and Materialists. In this first installment of his article, he takes in hand M. Ausonio Franchi and Herr Louis Büchner, of "Force-and-Matter" notoriety, and exhibits them in their naked deformity. The style and the general treatment of the subject are admirable, and if the second article keeps the promise of the first, perhaps we shall give our readers the benefit of a translation.

M. Naville's paper is followed by a lengthy article entitled "Milton, the Puritan," from the pen of M. Matth. Lelièvre. Milton is, as might be expected, almost unknown in France. Little has been done to make the French people acquainted with him. For Voltaire, Milton was "the author of a barbarous poem, sometimes sublime, on Adam's apple;" for Victor Hugo, he was a fanatic and a declaimer; and for M. de Lamartine, a peg on which to hang his own windy and empty declamations. It is, therefore, a pleasant surprise to read, in a French review, such an appreciative article on the author of Paradise Lost, as the one before us, which was occasioned by the appearance of a work entitled "*Milton, sa vie et ses œuvres*," by Edward de Guerle, who, in the years 1861–3, contributed a number of articles on the same subject to the *Revue Chrétienne*. In the February number there are two articles of special interest, one on "The Gospel in Spain," and the other on "The Ignorance of the Holy Scriptures in France in the Nineteenth Century."

4.—*Waarheid in Liefde. Een godgeleerd Tijdschrift voor Berschaafde Christenen. Naar de Behoefte dezer Dagen.* (Truth in Love. A Theological Journal for Educated Christians. According to the Demands of the Age.) Groningen. Holland. 1869. *January.*

This excellent religious monthly, which has been published since 1866, by Hofstede de Groot and other able theologians, is the organ of that party in the Dutch Church which is opposed to dogmas, but holds fast to Christianity—the so-called Groningen School. The leading article, in the present number, is entitled, "The Present Condition of Religious Parties," and seems to be the first of a series on this topic. The intention is to discuss thoroughly the character of the various parties to the great religious controversy of the present day. Before doing this, the writer proceeds to set the point at issue in a clear light. "There has always been conflict in the Christian Church, but the point about which men have fought has been shifted from time to time. So the conflict has been continually changing its character. Although many a doctrine, which has been the object of controversy, continually reappears as such, it is, nevertheless, in another connection and with another meaning." Glancing rapidly at the various points of controversy in past centuries, the writer then puts the question: "What is, at the present time, the central point of controversy in religious matters?" Many think it is

to be found in the domain of historical criticism; he is of a different opinion. For him it is in "the acceptance or rejection of Supernaturalism." This being settled, he addresses himself to the exhibition and trial of Naturalism, with which the present article concludes. This is followed by a paper entitled "Israel and Jesus Christ—Conversation with a Jew," communicated by Hofstede de Groot. Then comes an article with the caption "Paul, the Chief of Sinners," by A. van Toorenenbergen; and finally one on the "Acts of the Apostles."

5.—*Theologische Studien und Kritiken.* 1869. *Erstes Heft. Gotha.*

This is one of the ablest of the German theological quarterlies. It was founded by Dr. Ullmann and Dr. Umbreit, and many of the ablest of the Protestant theologians of Germany have contributed to its pages. It is now in its forty-second year, and is edited by Dr. Hundeshagen and Dr. Riehm. It represents, in the highest sense, the evangelical side of German theology, and belongs to the *Reformed* school, rather than the Lutheran.

Under the division of *Abhandlungen*, or elaborate original articles, we have in the present number, 1. *Apocalyptic Studies*, a very thorough investigation of the Book of Revelation, by Prof. Dr. Weiss. 2. *The Fundamental Traits* (Grundzuege) *of Christ's Doctrine of Salvation in the Synoptics*; i. e., in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, by Diaconus Herman Weiss. 3. A short review of the old historian and moralist, Hermann von Reichenau, of the eleventh century. Under *Thoughts* and *Observations*, (second division,) there is an article, by Tholuck, discussing the modern Lutheran doctrine of the Sacrament of the Supper, in which he shows that modern Lutheranism has evidently and essentially departed from Luther's doctrine. The second article under this head is an interesting account of the martyrdom of Johannes *v.* Draendorf, who was burnt by the Catholic Church at Worms in 1425. In the *Recensions* we have a review of an admirable work by Kritzler, entitled *Humanity* (Human Culture) *and Christianity*. From the review and the passages quoted, we judge that this work is of a high order of merit. It takes a decided stand against the modern, unbelieving, materialistic pretensions against the Holy Scriptures and the Christian faith. It shows that the "Culture" that arrays itself against Christianity is a false one; and that true "Culture" and Bible go together. We feel tempted to give some short passages from the book to show its tenor and bearing, as it is so cheerful after the long night of religious unbelief that not long since rested over German Christianity, a bright day from on high is rising higher and higher over the land. Of these materialistic philosophers he says: "It is narrow prejudice, when they, dazzled by the riches of creation which they see in one domain, recognize no other domains; it is presumption, when they, wherever the demands of faith

come in conflict with their theories, insist that faith shall at once surrender at discretion. In our day is yet true of this modern materialistic philosophy the word of Plato, ὕλη ἀληθινὸν ψεῦδος," (the *material* is the real falsehood). "They deny the Beyond, because, as they say, they know only what is here, and deny the Spirit, because, as yet, no anatomist and physiologist has discovered it with the microscope and the dissecting knife. The denials of that in which rests not only all foundation for the past, but in like manner also all liberty, morality, happiness, and responsibility; these infidel pronunciamentos of the deification of the flesh, that, reposing on the authority of science, are heard on the streets; these men, who declare piety toward God a folly: no wonder if all this reminds pious Christians of the apocalyptic beast that rises up from the abyss and testifies against the truth." Of the modern rationalistic Bible-criticism he says: "What stands as a holy temple in history, as a living fountain of life in the heart, became in its hands a chaotic pile of ruins. Christ became Renan's Child of Nature, that charmed the women, Schenkel's Redeemer, to whom every thing is wanting that could redeem. . . To-day, in spite of all attempts at concealment, we stand in the face of the dilemma; the appearance of Jesus was either that of the Son of God, or that of a deceiver and one deceived." It is evidently a book written with the deepest earnestness, with eloquence, and with extraordiary power, just such a book as the present hour in Germany demands.

6.—*Theologischer Jahresbericht.* 1869. *Vierter Jahrgang. Erstes Quartal.*

This is a Quarterly of some hundred and twenty-six pages, that devotes itself to giving reports of the theological works appearing in Germany; of the more important of these full notices and reviews, at some length, are given. It offers a good view of the spirit and tendency of German theological and religious literature. The subjects discussed are themselves an object of interest and of study. This number gives only the books that appeared from January to March of 1868. We notice quite a number of solid works on Exegetical and Historical Theology, the latter embracing the general domain of the Church history and the "Culture-history" of humanity, and many special fields of modern ecclesiastical history. The Germans have been and are remarkable for the large attention they give to this department of study and writing; because their universities cultivate Church history in a high degree, and perhaps, also, because Germany in the past centuries is a vast, rich field of historical interest. The best, as well as the most, Church histories, general and particular, are from German hands.

We observe also that the conflict between Rationalism and Evangelical Christianity in Germany is actively employing the German mind, and is

giving birth to a good number of books, large and small. The evangelical party is evidently mustering its strength, and marching bravely and well-armed, and in strong numbers, into the field. Some very solid works are coming from the theologians on that side; their opponents, among these the busy, inevitable Dr. Schenkel, of Heidelberg, are also not inactive.

The controversy on Romanism is occupying a good deal of literary attention, and a considerable number of books, and a still larger number of *brochures*, this light but effective artillery in literary warfare, are announced from the press.

Germany without Philosophy is inconceivable. The discussion of philosophy in its relations to Christianity is a constant and endless theme for German theologians, especially Protestant theologians. Every year adds a number of books to the already multitudinous philosophy-and-religion literature of Germany.

One of the best signs in the religious literature records is the number of books devoted to woman, and written for woman. All honor to Germany for this! There is also a peculiarity of the Germans that is prominent in the catalogues of religious books, and that is the vast number of *Sermons* published. This comes under the head of *Religious Ascetic Literature*, that intended for private religious edification and culture. This section is well represented in the book lists. One of the fullest divisions is that announcing works on *Hymnology* and *Church Music*. The Germans cultivate this field as no other people; the number of new productions the creative musical mind, perhaps we should say, *soul*, of Germany brings annually into being, is truly wonderful. One of the chief joys of the Germans, besides their philosophy, is music and song.

As a curiosity, we may add, in conclusion, that the Leipsic press announces a *Greek* religious book, published by *Wigand*, and written by *Andreas K. Demetrakopoulos*. Its title, translated into English, is *History of the Schism of the Latin from the Greek Orthodox Church*. While the book, according to the notice given of it, does not claim great merit for originality and force, still it is a good sign of the rising life of the modern Greek mind.

7.—*Unsere Zeit. Deutsche Revue der Gegenwart.* 1869. *Erstes, zweites, dritte u. viertes Heft. January and February.*

We mention this periodical, at this time, more especially for the purpose of calling attention to two articles by Prof. Schleiden on "Darwinism and the Doctrines connected therewith." As a contribution to the history and criticism of the development-theory they are well worth reading.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

SPAIN.—This country continues to be an object of great interest religiously as well as politically. Since the beginning of this year, the spirit and conduct of the Provisional Government has shown no signs of retrogression in the path of religious toleration on which it entered immediately on its establishment. All its declarations and actions reveal an honest and fixed purpose to destroy the terrible, inquisitorial, persecuting, and bloody religious intolerance of Spain, that, inaugurated and supported by the Catholic priesthood, has held bloody sway there for centuries, and up to the very hour of the departure of the bigoted Bourbon Isabella.

The Provisional Government has, during the past three months, in proclamations, addresses, answers to deputations, in letters, and in many other ways, reaffirmed the determination to establish free toleration of religion. A strong tendency has been manifested among the people, especially in Madrid, to support this determination. There is evidently, however, a powerful influence of the Catholic priesthood, and without a struggle, the latter, working through the bigoted masses, will not yield up the day. Referring to this secret *reactionary* influence of the clergy, the Government, in its proclamation of January 25th, while speakring of the murder of the Governor of Burgos, says, that "it will be an indelible stain on the Spanish nation, if upon it should rebound the opprobrium aroused by those who, to carry out *their sinister desires*, did not hesitate at seeking to arouse the troubles of civil war, *nor shrink from changing the words of charity and liberty, which are portions of Christianity, into deeds of blood and extermination, even as was done in ages gone by.*

"The Government has seen and observed in silence, but not unheedingly, a development of *a conspiracy* formidable not on account of the number or the valor of its authors, *but by its evident object to rekindle religious fanaticism*, and to stir up one of those fratricidal wars of which history has drawn so sad a picture, and in which catastrophes similar to that at Burgos are but as episodes." This passage, beyond all doubt, refers to the secret machinations of the *religious* leaders of the people—the priesthood. On the opening of the Constituent Cortes, also, the Ministers, in explaining their actions, stated, among other things, that "*the Jesuit College of St. Vincent was suppressed because its members were engaged in a conspiracy against the Government, and three of its members were accomplices in the murder at Burgos.*"

As was done, on the first inauguration of religious toleration and the suppression of priestly absolutism in other Catholic countries, as France, Mexico, and Italy, so also in Spain, the Provisional Government decreed the confiscation to the State, that is, the *secular utilization* for the actual good of the nation, of the enormous treasures lying heaped up for centuries in the Spanish Churches, partly also for the safe-keeping of treasures of art deposited there, and that were disappearing. The Governor of Burgos, by virtue of an order from Madrid, was proceeding, accompanied with proper officers, to take an inventory of the treasures in the cathedral of that city, when the archbishop in fury cried out

"Thieves, thieves!" the priests around him raised mad shouts of imprecations; the maddened crowd fell on the Governor, and with the blow of an ax struck him to the ground. They then, while the wretched man was yet living, tore out his eyes, and otherwise mutilated him, and finally cut off his head, and would have dragged the body through the streets, had not the armed police scattered the priest-incited mob. The archbishop has been arrested, with others of his priest-family, and the Government have declared that "the crime of Burgos will receive a prompt and exemplary chastisement, *let the authors thereof, or those who have incited or been accomplices in it, be they who they may.*" It is quite clear to whom this language points. The Government issued a special proclamation to the Spanish nation on the subject of the event at Burgos; and at Madrid the popular excitement, in consequence of this assassination, was so great that the Pope's Nuncio was singled out as the special object of the people's vengeance, and it was only by the protection afforded to the Nuncio by the other foreign ministers, and by the action of the Government to suppress the disorder, that he escaped. This in Madrid! The Pope was about to withdraw his minister, and he had already prepared to leave, when, on assurance given that M. Franchi should be protected and respected, he was allowed, for the present, to remain.

Protestant worship has been openly established at Madrid. The brave and gifted Protestant pastor, Ruet, a native Spaniard, but for years an exile, and laboring among his countrymen in Algiers, has now returned, and is preaching to crowded audiences. Governmental protection and countenance is publicly and most liberally given to Protestant religious activity. A large piece of ground has been sold by the Government, on the Promenade de Bilboa, for the building of a Protestant church, and by the authority of the Cortes, or national assembly, the work of erecting the edifice has begun.

Among the most important reforms inaugurated is that of a system of public common schools, on an excellent plan, the details of which, for the want of space, we are unable to give here; but it will be a great power to emancipate the people from their past tutelage under the priesthood.

SWITZERLAND.—The Protestant (Reformed) State Church of Switzerland is coming more and more under the dominion of the latent forms of rationalism. This is true especially of the German Cantons, but also of the French—Geneva, Pays de Vaud, Neufchatel. The cantonal authorities, in the control they exercise in the appointment of pastors, professors, and teachers, give encouragement to this "liberal Christianity," as it rejoices to call itself. Switzerland but follows Germany in this, at whose feet it sits. There is, however, in the mean time, a very perceptible evangelical element in all Protestant Switzerland, that is growing also daily in strength and earnestness. In the French Protestant Cantons this evangelical influence is making itself felt. The school of Gaussen, Malan, and D'Aubigne is a leaven that is slowly leavening many hearts. Besides this, the influence from the evangelical parties in France—the evangelical element in the Reformed National Church of France, which is not insignificant, of the Free French Churches, and of the French Methodists—is also making itself felt. In the German Cantons there is also a goodly number that do not "bow the knee" to this Baal of unbelief. An attempt has been made by the predominant "liberal" party to get rid of what has been, for a long time, a great "inconvenience" and "oppression to their consciences," and that is, the repetition, according to the ritual of the Swiss Reformed Church, of the Apostles' Creed, in which the great fundamental truths of the Gospel are declared. They do not believe in these, and therefore a movement has been made by them, as by the "liberal" party in the Reformed

French Church, to remove the Creed, this "rock of offense," from the Church service. This has opened a war in which both parties are showing a good deal of spirit. A polemical book has just been published in Zurich, defending the retention of the Creed. It is by I. R. Wolfensberger, pastor in Zollikon, Canton Zurich, and is entitled, "The Zurich Church Prayers, in their Historic Development."

There is a prospect also, that, in obedience to the progressive spirit of the age, there will be, in the not far future, a separation of Church and State in Switzerland, as in other free lands. Now it is a curious and noteworthy fact, that it is precisely these "liberals" that, in France and Switzerland, dread this event, as fatal to them. They are aware that the hour that the State ceases to give them dominion and pecuniary support, they will have to rely on the voluntary choice and support of the people, and the latter will not be obliged, willing or unwilling, to *support* them. Hence the day of their rule is gone.

GERMANY.—In *Prussia* there still continues a good deal of trouble with the *Lutherans* that refuse to be merged into the National Prussian Church called the *Union.* This Union, effected largely through the efforts of the last kings, (chiefly the late King William IV, brother of the present monarch,) is a merging into one of the German Reformed and the Lutheran elements, the former being predominant in numbers and influence. The leading religious men of Prussia, such as Tholuck, Krummacher, and a host of others, belong to this United Church. In other parts of Germany, as well as in America, these two sister Churches, so very intimately allied, also laid by their distinctive confessional peculiarities, and formed Church unions, sometimes old Lutheran, sometimes Reformed preachers, becoming pastors of these Churches. The German Reformed Churches generally, with all readiness, gave in their adhesion to this Union in Prussia. The old Lutheran element is far more unyielding, and in many instances boldly stood out against any coalescence with the other Churches. In several of the older, especially the eastern, provinces of Prussia, as Posen, for example, the old Lutheran element maintained, determinedly, a separate existence. Throughout the kingdom generally, also, separate Lutheran Churches, or associations of Churches, obstinately resisted all efforts at drawing them into the Union. The Government has unweariedly labored to win them over, but without much success. Up to the victorious campaign which culminated at Königgratz, this question of Union and Lutheran separation was, as the Germans would call it, one of the "burning" religious questions in Prussia, engaging the constant attention of the Government, and also the religious Protestant press, in perpetual discussions. Almost every one of these papers, in every number, had something to say about the everlasting topic of "the Union" and "the Lutherans." The annexation, through the great victories of Prussia, of Hanover, and several other lesser lands to the Prussian kingdom, has greatly increased this trouble, as it has enlarged the area of the strife. These annexed "lands" bear, of course, no particular good-will to the House of Brandenburg. They feel that, as a great calamity, the great dragon has swallowed them up. We are willing, they tell you, to be Germans, but not Prussians. The religious element is always the strongest in man, and the last to yield. So, in these conquered, "annexed" lands, the clergy were the last to renounce their old allegiance and swear to the new. This is true especially in the kingdom of Hanover — that was. Here the Lutheran clergy, with no goodwill either to the State or the Church of Prussia, stood out a long time. After the annexation, efforts were immediately made to bring all the Churches—that is, the Lutheran and Reformed—into the *Union.* This caused great excitement to

the Lutherans, who, as in Hanover, are sometimes in the majority. Great efforts are made by them to resist every such effort; to assert and maintain their strict separate existence; and finally to induce the Government, as a matter of right to them, to recognize them as on a full equality with the United State Church, and, as such, to grant to them an equal State support. This is one of the chief controversies now among the ruling Protestants in Prussia. This controversy is carried on with great vigor, and often with much bitterness, the Lutheran party generally showing more of this than their opponents. They are appealing to all the great memories and inspirations of the past great days of Lutheranism; of the devotion of the Lutheran fathers to the doctrines of Luther. They are reviving, in many respects, the old points of controversy between them and the Reformed. They are laboring also to arouse a strong spirit of enthusiasm and devotion by taking the position of the persecuted confessors of their reformation-faith, the Gospel-faith. The Lutheran spirit, when genuine and once aroused, is quite able to match the spirit of the sister Church, that has always shown a milder and a more charitable disposition. The Lutheran spirit is strong, stern, and unyielding. Some of these Lutherans go so far as to declare that the minister that gives the communion to a member of the Reformed Church has denied the faith, and is guilty of sin. The Lutheran clergy are seeking to get up great "mass-movements" and "demonstrations" in behalf of their cause, and in every way are rousing up opposition to the efforts of the Government and the Union to bring them over, and "rob them of their rights." They might, of course, in peace maintain a separate position, *independent* of the Government; this, however, is wholly inconceivable to them, as the idea of a Church and State Union, and of subvention from the State, is so strictly a Lutheran idea that the Lutheran Church, in the Old World, can not imagine or endure existence without it. This notion is much stronger with them than with the Reformed Church.

The question of common schools, that is, *unconfessional* schools, where no religious creed is taught, is also beginning to excite a good deal of attention in Prussia, as in other parts of Germany and in Hungary. It is very difficult for a Pedobaptist State Church, and such State Churches all are, to give up the idea of these confessional schools; yet it will have to come to this at last.

BADEN.—At Mannheim the question of common unconfessional schools was submitted to the vote of the people, on the 29th of January, and it was carried in their favor. Heretofore Protestants and Catholics had separate schools; now the schools will be "mixed," that is, common. Many Catholics voted for it, and almost all the Protestants. Cannon were fired, flags displayed, and other signs of joy given, in honor of this triumph of free thought over ancient religious bigotry.

HUNGARY.—The Hungarian Minister of Religious Affairs and of Instruction laid before the Reichstag the scheme of a law for the organization of popular schools. The Protestants are especially opposing this new law, as it tends to abolish their separate confessional schools. According to it, the Ministry of Public Instruction has the right to control the confessional as well as the unconfessional schools, so as to examine the teachers, and mode of teaching, as to their fitness; and if the separate religious schools prove themselves unsatisfactory, they are at once to be dissolved, and national schools, freed from any special creed teaching, are to take their place. After this plan was reported on by a committee of competent persons, it was finally acted on by the Reichstag, and, with slight modifications, adopted.

EDITORS' ROUND TABLE.

UNSECTARIANISM AND THE DOCTORS.—Some of our exchanges are evidently in trouble about our effort to publish an unsectarian Review. They can not see how such a thing can be done, and hence declare that our express purpose to advocate "Primitive Christianity, as distinguished from the religion of Sects," is "rather presumptuous, and certainly the quintessence of sectarianism."

Now, we confess to a kind of sympathy for these theological doctors. They have been so long under the despotism of human creeds, that it is with great difficulty they can understand the freedom of the Gospel. They have been so much in the habit of listening to the traditions of men, it is not strange they should denounce an effort to return to the simple faith and practice of the Apostolic Churches a "specious plea" and, at best, nothing but "sectarian unsectarianism."

We are told that "bodies of men, who agree in their general interpretation of the New Testament, can efficiently associate together to worship God, according to their understanding of the revealed modes and spirit of that worship, and to labor for the propagation of the religion of the New Testament, as they understand and believe it. Without this common interpretation and this bond of union and sympathy, the Church, as a whole, and the denominations, as sects, would be but ropes of sand."

It is here declared that an agreement in a "general interpretation" of the New Testament is quite possible. In fact, "without this common interpretation," the Church and the denominations would be in a sad plight. Very well. But if an agreement in a "general interpretation" is possible, is it not likewise possible to have an agreement in every thing that the New Testament teaches? And if the first is so important, may not the last be important also? It must be evident to all, that the New Testament can be *understood*, or it *can not*. If it can not, then all responsibility is at an end; but if it is a *revelation* of the Divine Will to man, (which it surely is,) then it is the duty of every Christian to labor for an agreement, not only in general matters, but in every thing that belongs to the Christian life. This is our purpose. And while we treat every one who may differ from us with candor and fairness, we shall not fail "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." We believe the only way to come to the "unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God," is to *labor* for it. That the whole subject of Christian union is involved in difficulty, we readily grant. But surely we shall never solve this difficulty by resting satisfied with the matter as it now stands. The spell of sectarianism must be broken; the conscience must be freed from the shackles of human systems, and then we can hope for a return to the apostolic faith and practice.

THE CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH ON THE RAMPAGE.—The first number of the *Quarterly* seems to have seriously affected the nerves of the special organ of his Reverence, the Archbishop of Cincinnati. We congratulate the friends of truth upon these archiepiscopal manifestations. Nothing could be better to display the *true spirit* of Catholicism than the four or five columns of editorial matter which recently appeared in the *Catholic Telegraph* concerning the *Christian Quarterly*. "Whom the gods will destroy they first make mad."

THE

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1869.

I.—THE FAILURE OF PROTESTANTISM.

Sermons on the Failure of Protestantism, and on Catholicity. By the REV. FERDINAND C. EWER, S. T. D., Rector of Christ Church, New York. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1869.

WE do not intend so much a review of the book, whose title heads this paper, as a survey of the ground which it professes to explore. No bomb-shell has been thrown into the Protestant encampment of late with such telling effect as this; not, we are inclined to think, on account of the size or dangerous character of the bomb, but because the present uneasy and anxious state of mind among Protestants—a sort of semi-consciousness of weakness and error—allows a panic to be easily created. There is, in the present condition of the public mind in the Protestant world, a foreshadowing of approaching disaster. Her soldiers, in troubled dreams, see a cake of barley bread tumbled into the host, which, rolling against the sacred tent in which her chief treasures are concealed, crushes it to the ground; and when such a Gideon as Rev. Ferdinand C. Ewer, S. T. D., comes with a band of only three hundred, even though it be with empty pitchers, and glare of torches, and blare of trumpets, *mere noise* and *flash* is enough, at such a time, to create confusion and strike dismay into a strong army, until "every man's sword is against his fellow," and a general rout ensues.*

* See Judges vii.

We live in an age of prying curiosity, of bold irreverence, when little respect is shown to the idols of the past. Forms, once venerated, are scouted contemptuously; creeds, once more powerful than the Bible itself, are scornfully repudiated; names, once of almost cabalistic sacredness and power, are bandied about with vulgar disrespect, and reduced to utter impotence.

PROTESTANTISM has been to many millions a word of sacred spell—the synonym of Christianity. It has stood for all that is spiritual in religion, pure in morals, free and progressive in intellect, energizing and ennobling in social development. To question its integrity, or insinuate a doubt of its perfection, was to inherit ecclesiastical damnation. To overthrow Popery, and make the world Protestant, was the brightest dream of millennial glory that cheered the toils and conflicts of the champions of Protestantism. Its contradictory creeds, its jarring sects, its hopeless discords, its State religions, its disgusting formalisms, its extravagant reactions of Pietism, Mysticism, and Rationalism, its persecutions and oppressions—all these paled into nothingness before the magical glory of the name PROTESTANT, and the luster of its achievements in the emancipation of the nations from spiritual and ecclesiastical thralldom. To question its merits, or accuse it of weakness or wrong, was to go over to Popery, or to become infidel. It was safe, only, to swell the popular cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." But, note the change. Here comes a bold iconoclast, with not a very large hammer, nor vigorous arm, and smites this image directly in the face, and rudely mutilates it, and even attempts to tumble it from its pedestal and expose it, a broken and helpless thing, to the scorn of the world; and there is scarcely a man to lift a finger against him! It is not unlike, in its results, to the scene described by Luke in Ephesus (Acts xix): "Some, therefore, cried one thing, and some another; for the assembly was confused, and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together."

We have read, with some care, Mr. Ewer's sermons. We have been at pains to read numerous comments and replies from the religious press. We are compelled, in candor, to say that, while the sermons are not remarkable for logical consistency or critical acumen, they are entirely superior to any thing we have yet seen in the replies; and Mr. Ewer's rejoinders, so far as he has rejoined, leave

him master of the field. We have never seen, in Protestant ranks, such chariness, such trembling reconnaissance, such timid skirmishing, and failure to grapple manfully with the foe. This, we repeat, is owing to no prodigious stature or invincible prowess in the Goliah that defies them—for we hope to make it appear, before we close, that he is altogether vulnerable—but because he has spoken to the consciences of Protestants when he declares Protestantism a failure, and only puts into a bold utterance that which was vaguely and dismally brooding over the religious consciousness of the world.

We are far from conceding, however, that Protestantism is, in any peculiar sense, a failure, as compared with Roman Catholicism, or Anglican Catholicism—as Mr. Ewer would pompously dignify the Church of England—or Greek Catholicism. (We trust the reader will pardon the use of these self-contradictory appellations, as we only employ them to represent fairly Mr. Ewer. They are themselves a keen satire on his pretensions to Catholicity.) In the union of these three, our sermonizer would realize his best conception of "the holy Catholic Church." We are bold to say that, in comparison with any or all of them, Protestantism is *not* a failure.

Protestantism has "failed to reach the masses." True. But what of the "Anglican branch of the one great Church"? Mr. Ewer is constrained to admit that it "has no more succeeded with the masses than has Protestantism." And what of the Roman Church? "The masses" are "reached" by her, it is true; but reached to be held in ignorant vassalage to priestly authority, and in political and moral degradation. True, Mr. Ewer says to a certain respondent who denied that Romanism reaches the masses, "He has, perhaps, forgotten that when the mob raged through our streets, defying all the power of our police and soldiery, the lifted finger of the archbishop calmed and dispersed it in an hour." Arch satirist! could he more seriously thrust the Romanists under the fifth rib? Who were this "mob," which the lifted finger of the archbishop could calm, but the very "masses" of the Roman Church—*the legitimate product of her doctrines and her sacraments*—prompted to these deeds of diabolical fury and outrage by the very ignorance and superstition in which the Church had reared them. Romanism reaching the masses, forsooth!

And what has the Greek Church done with the masses, that it numbers fewer than Protestantism to-day? Indeed, on the score of

success in dealing with men, Protestantism, in three hundred years, numbers one hundred millions, while the Greek Church, in eight hundred years, numbers but about eighty millions, and the Roman Church in twelve hundred years, or, according to her own pretensions, in eighteen hundred years, backed, too, for the larger portion of the time by the thrones of Christendom, numbers but one hundred and ninety-five millions.

Protestantism is "prolific of sects." True. But wherein is it worse than the Catholicism of which Mr. Ewer boasts? Look at his Anglican Church, with all the power of the English throne, and all the patronage of the British Government to maintain and enforce its claims; yet surrounded and almost overwhelmed with the numerous sects which have sprung out of its bosom! To-day the power of these sects is so overshadowing, that the State Church exists only by sufferance, and quakes with fear of utter overthrow. Our author has himself given a list of nearly *two hundred* sects that afflicted the Church before Protestantism was born, and adds: "Surely sectarianism has tried often enough to found a lasting form of the Church." We reply: Surely the so-called Catholic Church has tried often enough to kill sectarianism! With such a brood of vipers crawling from her bosom, it ill becomes any of her champions to taunt Protestants with the number of their sects. Even this triune Catholic Church for which our author contends—the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican—(for the Roman is Catholic, and the Greek is Catholic, and the Anglican is Catholic, and these are not three Catholics, but one Catholic)—even this trinity of Catholic Churches can not "agree in one." They have no fellowship with each other. Every effort to patch up a union between the Roman and Greek Churches has failed. The Greek Patriarch has recently snubbed the Roman Pope in his haughty rejection of the invitation to attend the coming ecumenical council. The English bishops have done the same. On the other hand, Rome treats these schismatics as unfit to be recognized until they return in sackcloth and ashes, and acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. Mr. Ewer's plea for Catholicity is met with a storm of ridicule from the Roman camp. Yet these three unreconciled and irreconcilable bodies, without the least reocgnition of each other, or the slightest intercommunion, are held forth as the divine pattern of Catholicity, to the confusion of Protestant sects, which, to say the least, generally

acknowledge each other, and interchange many friendly tokens of Christian regard and sympathy!

Protestantism "ends in rationalism and infidelity." And have no rationalists and infidels come forth from the Anglican and Roman Churches? Is it needful to do more than mention France and Italy, or more than name Colenso and the authors of the celebrated "Essays and Reviews"? There is this to be said of the difference between Protestants and these so-called Catholics in reference to rationalists and infidels. Among the former, doubt springs from the freedom of investigation; and, whatever may be the temporary aberrations or eccentricities of free and enlightened mind, they are more tolerable and more hopeful than that utter stagnation of intellect and blind slavery to authority which, among the Catholics, is the fearful price paid for faith—a dumb, deaf, blind faith, which fails to rise to the dignity of intelligence, and falls below God-implanted animal instincts; while, among the latter, unbelief is the desperate revolt of the rational nature against the intolerable absurdities, mummeries, corruptions, and tyranny of the Church. The former may be won back by purer light; the latter, if not hopelessly alienated, must be won to something else than that which they have renounced. In fact, our author admits that "Romanism has also made infidels in Italy and France." How, then, is Protestantism a failure, on this score, more than Romanism?

This term "Protestantism" is not altogether definite. It is used, sometimes, in a semi-philosophical and semi-political sense, as descriptive of the soul's protest against human sovereignty over the conscience, and as affirming, broadly and resolutely, the responsibility of man to God alone for his convictions. In this sense, pretty much all rationalists, and infidels, and skeptics, of whatever hue or grade, are Protestants quite as much as believers in the Bible, and the latter contend for Protestant principles quite as much for the benefit of the former as for their own advantage; since the doubter and the unbeliever have an equal right with the believer to their own convictions. But, again, we use the term Protestantism in an ecclesiastical or religious sense, to describe that portion of those who protest against the tyranny of the Church of Rome, who, while acknowledging God as alone Lord of the conscience, acknowledge the Bible as revealing the will of God, and its perfection as a rule of faith and

a law of right. This we take to be the current meaning of the word, and, in this sense, Protestantism is no more responsible for the rationalism of to-day than were the apostles for the treachery of Judas, or the primitive Church for the malice of Alexander the coppersmith, or the arrogance of Diotrephes.

Now, in the former sense, Protestantism is by no means a failure. The might of her principles and the growth of her empire are steadily increasing. She not only emancipated several of the nations of Europe from a terrible ecclesiastical thralldom, but gave birth to ideas and principles whose regenerative and revolutionary power has never ceased to be felt. It has smitten to the dust the divine right of kings as well as of pontiffs; it has stripped Church and State of arrogant claims, and exalted the individual man to a sacredness which formerly belonged only to orders and castes; it has overthrown slavery, alike of soul and body; it has led the nations under its control along the paths of reformation, evermore to new conflicts and new triumphs, until a thousand hoary and oppressive errors, once worshiped, are forever accursed; it has liberalized governments; purged jurisprudence of many absurdities and wrongs; revolutionized science; nursed the practical arts into prodigious growth, and built up empires of a nobler and completer civilization than the world ever saw before. And these same principles are working mightily, even now, for the final overthrow of the political and ecclesiastical despotisms of which the Roman Catholic Church is the champion. Austria, Hungary, Italy, Spain, are, in the mighty revolutions now going on, glorious witnesses that Protestantism is not a failure. Our own glorious land, with her matchless treasures of freedom, education, and popular sovereignty, sends out a testimony to the vitality and integrity of Protestantism whose luster reaches to the ends of the earth—whose voice echoes with quickening power among the oppressed of all lands. It is madness to stand in this Protestant land, in the enjoyment of Protestant liberties, and proclaim Protestantism a failure—all the while indebted to that very Protestantism for the right of making the proclamation! Let Mr. Ewer go to Rome, to his beloved Roman branch of the Catholic Church, and presume to preach that Romanism is a failure, and he will get such a taste of the sweets of Catholicity as will prevail, much sooner than any other logic, to rectify his judgment.

But this reverend champion of Catholicity, knowing the force of such a simple statement of facts, has done his best to break it. We submit a quotation to this effect:

"The real cause of the light and advance of modern times is not a theological dogma, but it is a general awakening of mind which began far back in the middle ages, four hundred years before the Protestant dogma was ever thought of—an awakening of mind, of taste, of the genius of invention, which, abandoning the rude structures of the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, brought out, long before the Continental Reformation, the most ornate specimens of architecture the world ever saw; which, in the eleventh century, invented paper, and, before John Calvin and Martin Luther ever saw the light, produced the art of printing—paper and printing, the two conservers of human intelligence; which, in the twelfth century, devised banks of exchange and discount, and not long after invented gunpowder; conceived the idea of the post-office, and discovered and applied the principle of magnetism in the mariner's compass, thus giving such a start to commerce and magnificent geographical discovery as they had never had before; which, in the tenth century, contrived clocks; which invented painting in oil colors before Luther was born; which, in the thirteenth century, introduced astronomy and geometry into Europe, and not long after brought in algebra, and fostered all three sciences; which discovered America a quarter of a century before the Continental "Reformation," so-called, opened; which, centuries before Luther, produced a Dante, and a Petrarch, and a Chaucer, and a Boccaccio, and a Roger Bacon—Roger Bacon, who, three centuries before his successor, Lord Francis Bacon, announced to the world the very method of legitimate investigation, in accordance with which all modern science is pursued, and upon which Lord Bacon afterward built his fame—Roger Bacon, of the so-called dark ages, who had this immense advantage over the Bacon of the sixteenth century, in that he personally put his method into practice. . . . Protestantism was but one of the effects of the general awakening of mind, not its cause; and our charge is, that it happened to be one of the bad effects—not in that it struck at Roman error, but because it sought to destroy Catholic truth also."

Now, without pausing to dispute the fairness of any of these statements, we beg leave to say that the difficulty is not met, but evaded. It is not claimed that Protestantism is the source of all the progress of modern times, or that all men were but savages and slaves before Martin Luther appeared; but it *is* claimed that the Roman Catholic Church, having all the advantages of this "general awakening of mind" before Protestantism was born, and possessed of all facilities for turning it to the world's advantage, has, in spite of this general awakening, thrown herself across the path of progress, clinging to the superstitions and tyrannies of the past, so that her sway, even to this day, holds nations in ignorance and slavery; while Protestantism has availed herself of this awakening of mind, and

helped it on, and has led the van of the hosts of freedom, and reared up the freest, most intelligent, and most progressive of the nations of the earth. We know that her course has been marked, at times, by great follies and wrongs. We know that the history of the Roman Catholic Church is not destitute of noble deeds and admirable achievements. We know, too, that in the main, the Roman Catholic Church has clutched, and even now clutches, the most odious doctrines of despotism, and clings to them as tenaciously in the person of Pius IX as she clung to them in that of Gregory VII, while Protestantism champions the cause of freedom, and fills the lands where she reigns with the blessings of civil and religious liberty. Why did not the "general awakening of mind" make the Spain, and Italy, and Austria of to-day better rather than worse than the Spain, Italy, and Austria of the past? Why has Spain sunken into imbecility? Why has France been deluged with the horrors of infidelity, and crushed by the iron heel of despotism? Why has Austria lost her prestige? Why the everlasting succession of crimes and horrors in Mexican and South American governments? How comes it that "the general awakening of mind" has brought these children of the Church no boon—while Great Britain, Prussia, and the United States have grown into their present grand proportions and conquering power? We repeat it, the difficulty is not met. Our author makes a plausible attempt to bewitch his readers into forgetfulness of the true issue, but he has certainly failed to show that Protestantism is a failure in the sense in which we have been using the term.

But when we come to the *religious* sense of the word, Protestantism *has* proved, so far, a failure; not a failure viewed relatively to the Greek or Roman Churches, but a failure in view of the work she undertook to accomplish. Her task was: a restoration of primitive Christianity; a re-enthronement of Christ in the hearts of the people as the only Lord; a re-assertion of the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice; the overthrow of popish and priestly authority, and the re-establishment of the universal priesthood of believers; a forsaking of all humanly-appointed rites and doctrines, and a return to the purity and simplicity of the primitive worship.

That it was a grand design none acquainted with the abominable

assumptions of Popery can doubt. That it has failed of entire success may be accounted for in reasonable ways, but that it *has* failed of complete success is patent to all who are cognizant of the present state of Protestant Christendom. As a state religion it has degenerated into formalism, ritualism, profligacy, hypocrisy, corruption, and intolerance, until it is scarcely better than that which it supplanted. It exalted *orthodoxy* at the expense of *character*, until soundness of doctrine was every thing, and purity of life nothing; and this necessarily gave birth to a reactionary pietism and mysticism, which, in its turn, produced the reaction of Rationalism, and thus the whole work has been terribly marred. In its best estate, in our own land, where it is happily freed from the corrupting touch of politicians, it is yet destitute of the grand features of the primitive faith—*simplicity, purity, unity, catholicity.* We have no desire to exaggerate the errors of Protestantism. We are anxious to see and appreciate all that is redeeming in it. We do not sympathize with Mr. Ewer in the eagerness and delight with which he presses every unfavorable fact into his service. Yet many of his statements are too sadly true. Read the following:

"The successors of the very magistrates who condemned Servetus, of the pastors who excommunicated him as the denier of the Trinity, now themselves unite in rejecting that doctrine. The faith of the great Churches of Geneva is Unitarianism. The system of John Calvin is almost extinct in the town where he was once the spiritual tyrant. There are believers in the divinity of our blessed Lord Jesus existing in Geneva, it is true, *who are divided into several parties*, but the national Church of Geneva is Unitarian. The number of inhabitants in Geneva amounts to about 64,000; among them are about 40,000 Unitarians, 18,000 Roman Catholics, and the miserable balance only are left to Protestant Trinitarianism."

His picture of New England's spiritual degeneracy; the testimony produced from Mr. Moody, of Chicago, that "city missions had proved failures on the ground that the wrangling among the different sects prevented the creation of permanent congregations from the converts made;" the numerous confessions gathered up from leading Protestants of the utter inefficiency of Protestant agencies to reach the masses of the people; his too faithful sketch of Protestant Germany and Switzerland—all these may well call the intelligent Protestant to pause and inquire candidly whether Protestantism is not a failure.

The following indictments against Protestantism, with its numerous and terrible counts, while it is falsely used by our author, is, nevertheless, worthy of careful and candid consideration:

"Its intolerance began in that violent man, Luther, a man who uttered such language concerning most sacred things as can not be repeated to ears polite. It continued in Calvin, than whom a more tyrannical spirit can hardly be conceived. It slew Mary, Queen of Scots, Strafford and Laud, and martyred Charles the First. It went in the Puritans to Holland, and was so cross-grained there, that when it sailed away the Dutchmen praised God for the merciful deliverance. It took ship and threatened to come to New York, and would have landed here had not the citizens found means to bribe the captain of the Mayflower to land his uncomfortable freight by mistake somewhere else. In Cromwell it would not be content to enjoy its own Congregationalism quietly; no, but it broke into the Church of England; it stripped off the garments from our clergy; with axes and hammers it broke down our carved work; [there is an immense proportion of genuine religion in 'garments' and 'carved work' in the estimation of Mr. Ewer;] it hanged witches; it drove out Roger Williams from its settlements into the inhospitable forests of Rhode Island, for the liberty of belief which he claimed; in the Quakers it would not be content to enjoy silent meetings, but must go in and disturb the Puritan meetings, with not only violent but indecent behavior, and then turning round, in the Puritans it hanged the Quakers; in the eighteenth century it pelted John Wesley through the streets, and broke up his meetings; in the nineteenth century it mobs our priests while at their solemn services in the east of London, and, as for our sisters of Mercy, for the crime those gentlewomen have been guilty of in devoting themselves to lives of charity and prayer, to watchings in pestilential hospitals, it attacks them in the streets with missiles until they fly for their lives."

We are well aware that it is only by a contemptible style of pettifogging that many of these counts can be sustained so as to prove what our author wishes to prove. We know full well that the intelligent student of history will at once detect an uncandid spirit and a partisan purpose in this presentment. Yet there is sufficient truth in it to show that Protestants did not readily rid themselves of the persecuting intolerance inbreathed from the Roman Catholic Church in which they had been reared, and taught anew to the Puritans by the Anglican Church, from whose violent hand they sped across the ocean to the American wilderness. Our author is so enamored of the sanctity of the "Roman branch of the Catholic Church," that he can not even represent it in a pronoun without a capital letter: it is "She," or "Her," or "It." Yet this magnificent and holy "She" is "drunk with the blood of saints;" and not the space of Mr. Ewer's sermons would suffice for the indictment against "Her." His own

Anglican branch was guilty of enormous wrongs against dissenters, for which it is no wonder if, when they had the chance, they stripped the "garments" from her clergy and defaced her "carved work." It comes with an ill grace, therefore, from this advocate of bloody ecclesiasticisms, to parade the intolerance of Protestants. Still, to us, there is significance in these unwelcome facts; and when, to all the discouraging facts presented, we add the startling one that *Protestantism is making no new conquests*, while Popery is, in our land, gaining on her, and Rationalism is draining away much of her strength, we are compelled to the conclusion that, however great and incalculable the benefits conferred on humanity by the revolutionary power of this protest against tyranny, it has failed to re-establish Christianity.

It is time to say that with the avowed object of Mr. Ewer we fully sympathize:

"We have stated that the Roman Catholic Church is a failure in so far as she is Roman. We set up Catholicity for the cure, not Rome. But the difficulty with these men is, that they do not seem to comprehend that there is any other kind of Christianity except Protestantism and Romanism; and they think that, if we say Protestantism fails, we mean, of course, that every body should take to Rome. They do not comprehend that there is a third presentment of Christianity, namely, Catholicity, with nothing distinctively Roman in it, and nothing distinctively 'Protestant' either. *The fact is, that, what with Rome and what with Protestantism, God's old Catholicity has been under a cloud, and has not gained the general ear of the people in America.* . . . There are thousands of men left outside the walls of any faith, who can not accept Protestantism, which they have shaken off, who will not surrender their proper freedom of thought to Rome, but who are craving for a faith of some kind, for a Christianity with reality, robustness, and common sense in it."

In all this we fully concur; and to this conclusion all candid Protestants must come at last. It only remains to ascertain what this "Catholicity" is, and where it is to be found, and the task is complete. Let us hear our valorous preacher on this most interesting point. He seeks to locate Catholicity in what he calls the three branches of the Catholic Church—the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican; and inquires:

"What faith is it, then, that they all hold in common? Not the thirty-nine articles, for they are merely Anglican; not the Tridentine decrees, for they are merely Roman; not the decrees of the Synod of Bethlehem, for they are merely Greek; but the faith as set forth by those great Councils wherein all three took part, wherein the whole Church spoke—the faith, namely, known as the Niceno-Con-

stantinopolitan Creed, which all three to-day accept, and which the whole Church has from the first accepted, even before those Councils set that faith in the framework of words."

And this is "God's Catholicity"! We ask for bread, and Mr. Ewer gives us a stone; for fish, and he gives us a serpent. We ask to be carried back to the pure fountain of "God's Catholicity," and he lands us three or four hundred years down the stream, amidst muddy and turbulent waters, polluted by Grecian philosophy, by Jewish ritualism, and by the carnal ambition of ecclesiastics whose growing power has led them into utter forgetfulness of the humility and spirituality of the primitive pastors of the Church of God. Even in the Apostles' time "the mystery of iniquity did already work," and men of perverse minds sought to draw away disciples after them. That this apostasy was to grow into fearful dimensions as soon as the restraining power of Pagan Rome should be withdrawn, we have Paul for a witness. Yet this advocate of "God's Catholicity" would land us where this "Man of Sin" is in the full bloom of his apostasy, and bid us behold, in this magnificent "deceivableness of unrighteousness," the Catholicity we are pining for! It will not do, Mr. Ewer. The "thousands" who are waiting "outside of Protestantism and Romanism," and craving a "Christianity with reality, robustness, and common sense in it," are not to be deceived with the gilded pomp and "lying wonders" of the apostate Church to which they are pointed. They are men of intelligence. They have read Isaac Taylor's "Ancient Christianity," and kindred works; they know the pious frauds, monkish asceticisms, ritualistic superstitions, sacramental extravagances, philosophical absurdities, and ecclesiastical assumptions of that period too well to be duped into the acceptance of this as the primitive Catholicity. Why this anxiety to obscure the "old paths," this hesitancy to ascend the stream until the original fountain is reached, "the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb"? Was there not a Gospel, uncorrupted by device of men—a Church, divinely planted, and constructed "according to the pattern shown in the mount," a "Catholicity" that was indeed "God's," being his own uncorrupted idea of a spiritual brotherhood meant to include "all nations, and kindreds, and tongues" in "one body," with "one Spirit," under "one Lord," inspired by "one faith" and "one hope," gathered

in by "one baptism," and loving and serving "one God and Father of all"?

Here we part company with Mr. Ewer, and with pretty much all Protestants, and bring forward the distinctive plea of the present Reformation—a *bona fide return to the Christianity of the New Testament, in letter and in spirit, in principle and in practice*—to Christianity as it was before the apostasy, as revealed by the Holy Spirit, and taught by the Apostles.

Let us sketch, very briefly, some of the prominent features of Primitive Christianity which Protestantism has failed to restore:

I. The Simplicity of its Creed.

II. The Spirituality of its Membership.

III. Its Unity.

IV. Its Catholicity.

I. Nothing is more remarkable in the Christianity of the New Testament than *the simplicity of its creed.* Protestants are apt to talk of "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," as their creed, yet they were never daring enough to carry this into practical effect. But this was not the original creed, for the whole Bible was not yet written, and that part which was written—the Old Testament—was not known to the generality of Gentile converts. Yet there was "one faith" which all were called to possess, without which none could enter the Church, and the possession of which was a certain passport at the portals of the spiritual temple. "JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD," was the original creed of Christianity—"the Apostles' creed"—for that which is generally styled such is confessedly spurious. *The Divinity and the Messiahship of Jesus;* this was the creed: the only creed to which assent was required in order to baptism and membership in the Church. This was uniformly required of Jew and Gentile. In becoming Christians they renounced all other lords, all other saviors, but Jesus, and gave to him, in baptism, their covenant pledge of trust, love, and service; and the only condition of fellowship in the Church was *loyalty to Jesus,* obedience to his laws as taught and enjoined by the Apostles. All who, trusting in the Son of God for salvation, were immersed by his authority into the names of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and continued patiently to keep his commandments, were "one in Christ Jesus;" whether male or female, rich or poor,

Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, they were "brethren," members of one holy, spiritual brotherhood, and heirs of eternal life. Outside of this faith and obedience they had no dominion over each other. No amount of difference of opinion, or habit, of race, or of former religious training, no amount of error even, was allowed to break the bonds of this fellowship so long as its members clung to faith in the Christ, and willing obedience to his precepts and ordinances. In all else, every individual was responsible only to God and to that law of Christian love which required that he should not use his liberty in a way to cause others to stumble.

Here is a basis—a *divine* basis—for unity and Catholicity. To build up a spiritual brotherhood out of all nations, the creed must be simple, the terms of fellowship divine in their authority. The Primitive Church did establish unity and Catholicity on this basis; it has never been effected since on any other basis. A departure from the primitive creed was the introduction of parties and sects, and with the growth of human creeds and human tests of fellowship has been the growth of sects and of the mischiefs of sectarianism. The reader of ecclesiastical history can not fail to notice in what is called the Apostles' creed, then in the Nicene, then in the Athanasian, how this departure from the simplicity of the original creed grew into an enormous apostasy, and how the "frame-work of words" in which men sought to express what God had never authorized to be expressed, became a shibboleth of party, and filled the Christian community with bitter and bloody strife.

Protestantism never returned to this simple creed. Protestant leaders had not faith enough to trust the soul and the conscience alone with Christ. Human creeds, abounding in speculative doctrines unknown to the Bible, and in ecclesiastical inventions and ordinations entirely of human origin, were fastened on the people; and the effect, from that day to this, has been to hold emancipated and progressive natures to standards of the past. If they outgrew them, they must protest and secede, and establish a new creed or a new interpretation of the old one, and in their turn give birth to other secessions and other creeds, and so on *ad infinitum*. There never was a greater imposition on the credulity of men than the pretension that these human creeds are faithful exponents of the faith and practice of those who subscribe to them. From the Augsburg Confession down, their

teachings and interpretations have been constantly in dispute. It has been gravely doubted by an eminent divine of the present time, whether in his "branch" of the Church there is even one minister who believes the entire creed. That the attempt to enforce human creeds has constantly increased the number of sects and the severity of strife, until Protestants seem hopeless and helpless in their endless diversities, is a melancholy fact that does not need to be argued or proved here. *The great mass of Protestants are a unit to-day in the original creed of Christianity, but in nothing else.* Offer them union in the acknowledgment of a Divine Savior, and they will flow together like kindred drops of water. Here alone, so far as creed is concerned, is union possible. The responsibility of division and of the consequent failure of Protestantism rests with those who insist on these unauthorized and mischievous standards.

Observe: we are not writing against such statements of doctrine or practice as may be necessary to cause a movement or a people to be understood in its distinctive features; nor against human vindications of divine truth, such as the age or the circumstances may demand; but *against making these authoritative* as undisputed standards of truth.

II. The *Spirituality* of the Primitive Church is another feature which Protestantism has failed to reproduce. For this there are two reasons:

1. The Primitive Church received none to membership but *willing confessors.* The Church was made up of professed believers, who came voluntarily within her pale, and there was little inducement, other than spiritual good, to draw them. It was, therefore, in a high sense, a spiritual brotherhood. But Protestantism has, most absurdly, clung with the utmost tenacity to that "relic of Popery," infant membership; a fruitful source of carnality, inasmuch as it supplies the Church by generation rather than by regeneration; and, to the extent to which it obtains, obliterates the distinction between the Church and the world, fosters the unhallowed union of Church and State, and subjects the Church's movements to considerations of State policy, the ambition or caprice of despots, and the intrigues of courtiers.

That Protestantism has been false to her own principles in this is evident when we consider that infant membership is unsupported

by precept or example in the New Testament; that it was imported into Protestant Churches from the Roman Catholics; and that the latter make it rest for authority on that very tradition which Protestants repudiate.

The extent to which the spirituality of the Church has been sacrificed by this human tradition can never be estimated. A single fact may aid us somewhat to appreciate it. Good old Richard Baxter stands among the most eminent pastors of his time, alike in the searching character of his preaching, and in the laboriousness of his life among the people of his charge. We look, therefore, to Kidderminster for a favorable exhibition of the spirituality of pedobaptism. That he did his best to make it as spiritual as possible, none will doubt who know of his life and character. Let this brief sentence tell the story:

> "And so, for fear of discipline, all the parish kept off (from the Lord's Supper) except about six hundred, *when there were in all above sixteen hundred at an age to be communicants.*" (Life and Times, i, 118.)

Here are a thousand out of sixteen hundred *members of the Church* held back, because of scandalous living, from the Lord's Supper, by the purity and zeal of a preëminently godly man! We leave the reader to reach his own conclusions as to the amount of spirituality to be expected, generally, in Churches supplied with members from the cradle, and, in State Churches, generally under the care of an ease-loving and carnal ministry.

2. The Primitive Church was in direct and positive antagonism with the world, and relied solely on spiritual forces for success. Protestantism has been allied with the State, and has been subjected to the embarrassments and corruptions growing out of State patronage and State control. That this has emasculated the faith and holiness of the Protestant Churches is beyond all question, and that Rationalism and Infidelity have been engendered and fostered by the formalism and corruption thus created, rather than by radical defects in Protestant principles, is to us equally clear. The creeds of Protestantism, too, and her ecclesiastical polities, have been largely shaped under the dictation of kings, cabinets, and parliaments; and, as the world learns more of the corrupt and disgusting history of royal duplicities, cabinet intrigues, and parliamentary management, they learn to reject with scorn, as bonds of spiritual fellowship, or as forms of

acceptable worship, the creeds, and rituals, and ecclesiastical polities which were framed to suit politicians or promote the cherished schemes of ambitious kings. We need only refer to the considerations of policy which gave shape to the doctrine, ritual, and ecclesiastical polity of the Church of England, resulting in "a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy;" and to the Westminster Confession, framed by men appointed by Parliament, and only adopted as it pleased Parliament to approve it. It surely is not strange that the present generation has outgrown *such* creeds, or that men should crave something having "more reality, robustness, and common sense" in it.

Of course, if the simplicity of faith and spirituality of the Primitive Church are wanting, we shall look in vain for her unity or her Catholicity. Hence, Protestantism is, in all these respects, a failure. Protestants must consent to see this, to acknowledge it, to abandon their errors, and make a complete return to the Christianity of the New Testament, or their failure will, in the next half century, become hopelessly apparent.

This is our plea before the whole Protestant world. We see in it, not only the possibility, but the certainty of that unity and Catholicity which creed-distracted Protestantism has utterly failed to reach. It seems like a bold venture, we are aware, to ignore a hundred heresies, and attempt to unite variant and discordant minds in a simple faith such as the Gospel announces; but it is scarcely bolder than the original work of Protestantism in knocking the shackles from the soul, and teaching men to think for themselves. Moreover, *it is divine*, and, therefore, safe and right. The flowing together of millions in such a divinely simple and beautiful faith would generate a spiritual enthusiasm in whose fires a thousand differences would be consumed; and in the gigantic moral triumphs growing out of such a union, with only Christ to plead for, and only his work of love to engage us, we should forget forever all former strifes, and blush to think that we had ever been divided. Then, indeed, it would appear, that, however Protestantism may be regarded as a failure, Christianity is not a failure. Her simple creed, her Divine Lord, her united hosts, her pure spirituality, her world-embracing benevolence, her heaven-born peace and harmony, her heavenly hopes and inspirations, would flood the earth with light and love, until the assumptions of Popery,

the cold, proud pretensions of Rationalism, the superstitions of heathenism, and the cruelties, and wrongs, and disorders of a world where sin so long has reigned, should retire confounded before the glory of the Church of God, and "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." Who, to hasten that day, would not yield party name and party creed, and be simply a disciple of Jesus?

We do not hesitate to avow the conviction that this world can never be regenerated only as Jesus, the Son of Mary and the Son of God, our blessed Mediator, shall become a living power in the hearts of men, through faith, to reunite them to God. No philosophy, no political management, no social science, no ritual, no human creed can accomplish this work. It must be a power within, not without; in the heart, not in the head; supernatural and divine, not rationalistic, ritualistic, or theological; it must be "Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God;" Christ the Savior, Christ the Brother, Christ the Lord, Christ the Hope of Glory. In this there is power to illuminate, purify, and regenerate human nature; and what more do we want to preach to the world, or to unite us in the holiest and lovingest of fellowships? Then let us lose all in Christ Jesus. Let party names drop. Let party creeds be forgotten. Let theological and metaphysical controversies be remanded to the schools where they belong. Let denominational interests be abandoned. Let Christ be "all in all." To Him be glory and dominion forever and ever.

II.—THE LIVING ISSUE.

THE movements of religious thought, in this country, in the nineteenth century, exhibit some of the most interesting and remarkable features to be found in the history of Christianity. The unsolved problems which past ages had transmitted to this, the number of master intellects engaged in their solution, the immense advance in all departments of knowledge, affording vastly increased facilities for the investigation of such questions, and all this coming at a time when an enlarged measure of political freedom made it possible for men to use their advantages, have contributed to make these movements among the most interesting in the history of the world. It is, in a great measure, true that each age is unconscious of what it is doing. A far-seeing mind, here and there, may have some glimpses of the far-off results of present processes; but the great majority of mankind must expend what force they have upon subordinate questions. Yet, when the logic of events has pronounced a conclusion, those who live at the time and comprehend it, have the "master light" which explains all the steps in its previous progress. We venture to think the age in which we live is such a time. The utterances of the present are explaining the mental struggles of the past. When we go back half a century, and look upon the controversies then in progress, we see a multitude of questions in the crucible of denominational experiment; and if we examine the effect produced by the ordeal upon contemporary thought, we find the minds of men bewildered by the scene of antagonism and confusion; but, if viewed from the point at which we now stand, when nearly twenty years of the last half of our century have gone, we discover that the great spirit of order which presides over and directs the world of mind, as well as that of nature, has brought out clearly into the field of vision two grand results, to which it is the object of this paper to invite the attention of the reader.

To do this intelligently, it will be necessary to review briefly the nature of the movement.

In the great mental conflicts of past ages, we recognize, first

of all, the deep longing of the spirit of man for repose, on the grounds of ultimate and universal truth. The human mind has never ceased to struggle for the discovery of propositions by which such grounds might be expressed. The largest part of the history of philosophy is but the record of the effort to find a method that might with certainty lead to this end, while the saddest cry of the human heart has come from its feeling of unrest when returning from its long and painful search unsatisfied and disappointed. The civilization in which Christianity, when it came, was planted, was created by the struggles of the intellect to discover the grounds of ultimate truth; hence, the type of mind which it encountered was ready to convert, or, rather, pervert, the simple and sublime truth left in the world by Jesus and his apostles into a means for pursuing its investigations. This led to that form of religious thought which we now wish to notice. Very early in the history of Christianity, religious dogmatism became the life of the Church. Whoever has glanced at the time which succeeded the apostolic age knows that the subjects of greatest interest had already become the truth or falsity of doctrine. Religious dogmas had begun to take the place in the intellectual world which philosophical dogmas had occupied through many preceding centuries. We do not travel far from the death of the last apostle until we find society convulsed by the collisions of religious opinion. The earliest writers against the Christian religion were enabled to reproach its disciples with their bitter and disgraceful quarrels. Before Rome had united to herself the political supremacy of the empire, there was remaining sufficient freedom for debate, and the distractions of the Church, produced by opposing doctrines, advocated by different eminent leaders, make up most of the history of the period. After her organization had matured sufficiently to enable her to interpose her authority, she began to settle authoritatively the dogmas which should form the belief of Christendom. The history of ecumenical councils affords the amplest materials for illustrating the point now before us, namely: that the great purpose of the intellectual life of the Christian world was, through many centuries, to determine which doctrines men should believe, and which they should not. It is no exaggeration to affirm that for more than fifteen hundred years of the Christian era, the object regarded as the worthiest of all thought was, to settle finally the subject

of doctrines. The places occupied in religious literature by the words orthodox and heterodox will stand in all times as a full demonstration of the position, if any is needed.

If we now examine the great Protestant movements we shall find the human mind still expecting repose in the doctrines of a creed. Luther comes before the world on a system of dogmas. The power which revolutionized the mind of Europe in the sixteenth century was a series of controversies on the subject of doctrines. It is not necessary here to state the particular dogmas upon which each of the great Protestant parties have successively, from Luther down to the present time, claimed the dominion of the human mind. The point now before us is the historical fact that the claim of each is based upon the assumption that its system of dogmas should form the ground of human belief. We do not forget the fact that these movements were each, in its own time, the best and largest measure of truth possible to men. We do not wish to forget that the great men whose names history will associate with them forever were among the truest workers for humanity; nor, that the issues upon which they have come successively before the world have formed the steps in the progress of all our civilization. All this, however, does not in the smallest degree change the position which we are considering, namely: that the religious life of Christendom, to the beginning of the nineteenth century, was a life of dogmatism. To this hour, underlying the Roman Catholic Church and every Protestant party, is its dogmatic statement of doctrines, which gives to each its organization; its form of worship; its denominational spirit; and its intellectual life. The human mind is still seeking the place of repose for which it has been struggling through the ages, and, to a large extent, in the circle of both Romanism and Protestantism, still expecting to find it in the propositions of a creed.

Now, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, there sprang up a movement wholly different in spirit and purpose from any of those to which we have referred. While creeds had it in their power to open to the mind of man wider views of truth, and to bring him larger measures of freedom than he had before, they followed each other as we have them in history; but the time had come when they had given to humanity all they had to give, and, as in the case of all obsolete forms of thought in the onward march of mind, they

became dead bodies lying in the pathway of human progress. This fact is the ground of the reaction which is now about to engage our attention. Dogmatism had produced its ripe fruit. Partyism in religion had narrowed the life of Protestantism into mental servility and bitterness. Large-minded and honest-hearted men, repelled by the untruthfulness of party spirit, and unfed by its lifeless dogmatism, were driven into antagonism to all formulas of doctrine outside of the Bible. The issue was no longer which were to be accepted and which rejected, but an unqualified rejection of all dogmatic statements of doctrine as such. While the revolt of the human mind against the tyranny of ecclesiastical dogmatism had occurred many times before—while those revulsions had marked some of the greatest changes human society has experienced—in no instance has it taken the same form, and led to the same results, as in this. The English, in the first half of the eighteenth century, failing to discriminate between the simple apostolic Christianity of the New Testament and the forms of Church life which had become so repulsive to them, in rejecting the one, rejected also the other, and, having nothing else to fall back upon but the prevailing philosophy of the time, were driven into Deism. In the last half of the same century a similar revulsion of the French mind ended in Atheism; and about the close of the century and the beginning of this, German thinkers had reached modern Rationalism. In America, under a wiser guidance, the reaction was to the New Testament. A feature of religious controversy unknown in the history of Christianity appeared. An issue which had not challenged the human mind since the apostolic age was now made and pressed with great force by the men who led the movement. The position that the teachings of Jesus and the apostles is the only creed of Christians, and the only ground of Scriptural ecclesiasticism, became at once the point against which every Protestant party directed the whole measure of its power for the space of a generation; but, opposition has only revealed its strength. Nearly all of its defenders in the first generation were men who had been trained in the creed Churches. Having embraced a position antagonistic to their former associations, the feeling of hatred which always follows those who leave a partisan organization increased the bitterness of the conflict. But, understanding the vulnerable parts of the systems they had left, they became the most formidable opponents; and now, after a

controversy of about fifty years, it is seen that the progress of the movement has not in the slightest degree been arrested. On the contrary, its present statistics would show that it is moving with a constantly increasing momentum and an accelerated velocity. Besides, its friends believe they see in the tendencies of the spirit of the age a guarantee of still more splendid triumphs in the future. Here then, in this new issue, the Bible against creeds, with the causes which led to it, we recognize the most remarkable phenomenon of religious thought in the first half of the nineteenth century in this country; and, in its success, we wish to emphasize the first of the two grand results mentioned at the beginning of this article. This, however, has been but the negative side of the movement. It has also its positive side, to which the first was but the introduction. In this will be found to reside the secret of its power. It will not be difficult to understand how one has inevitably developed from the other. Having, in the reaction from creeds, been driven to the Bible, the first question was to ascertain the true use of its teachings. It had already been decided that it was not given to men to be, by them, formulated into creeds; and, once in this position, the consciousness of the spirit's needs and its unsatisfied cravings soon accomplished the rest. If the "Father of Spirits" in giving to men his Word, regarded their deepest wants, then he meant, by that Word, to lead the world to Christ. The craving of the heart is for life, of the mind for light, and so we read: "*In him was life, and the life was the light of men.*" But, that this part of the subject may stand before the reader in the light in which we wish him to see it, let us glance at the corresponding movement of unbelief. To follow the revolt of the human mind against the Christian religion through all the forms of its misbelief, disbelief, unbelief, and antibelief, even if we possessed the learning and the genius requisite for such an undertaking, would lead us far beyond our present purpose. A few of the main facts is all that we now need to bring out the position we have in view. Infidelity, in most of its decided attacks, has been compelled, especially in the beginning of its opposition, to take the form given it by the corresponding attitude of Christianity. Hence, the points of its denial have varied frequently in the course of its history. When the aggressive force of the Christian religion was represented by formulas of doctrine, infidelity has begun by a negation of these. It is true, in the end, it has sought to

overthrow the facts upon which it has supposed these dogmas were based, and the form which its opposition to the facts of revelation has taken has generally been guided by the philosophy of the age and country in which the attacks were made. Yet, the objective points of its bitterest hatred have been the dogmatic systems by which they were at first repulsed. One of the most important clews to the philosophy of history will be found in a thorough study of the points of denial by each of the great movements of unbelief. Deism in England, Atheism in France, Rationalism in Germany, present us some remarkable phenomena in this respect. The last of these is that in which our present inquiry is concerned. Rationalism is the name by which the present active opposition to Christianity is expressed. Its history has been so often published that we deem a reference to its general features intelligible without detail. We are concerned, at present, with *the point*, we shall call it, of its denial. It is a truism, the most common now met with, that Infidelity has changed the mode of its attack. It would be more in accordance with the fact to say that it has changed both the manner and the point of its attack. For nearly a generation it has given but the smallest part of its attention to the common dogmas of religious belief. Its subject of investigation has been, and still is, the life of Christ. Intellects, which, in their power and in the extent and variety of their culture, rank among the first in the world, have directed the movement; and it would be strange if, by such minds, nothing was learned from the experience of centuries. Victories had been achieved over the dogmas of creeds which at the time seemed to promise great results. Many which had been supposed to wear the seal of infallibility had been driven almost from the memory of men; and yet, Christianity has lived on. When all the miracles of the four Gospels and the evidences of prophecy had been disposed of, as was supposed, by the widening range of natural law and the ordeal of historical criticism, the highest of all miracles, the life of Christ and the existence of Christianity, still remained. This life, then, must be displaced before another step could be taken in the progress of unbelief. The fountain must be dried up, or the stream will flow forever. This life has two sides, a human and a Divine. He is Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee; and he is the Christ, the Son of the living God. The principles that would destroy the history of Jesus would annihilate the veracity of all

history. This, then, must be admitted. But his claim to be received as the Messiah; what does this mean? It involves his right to be received as the life of the world and the light of men. But this is precisely what unbelief can not receive, and remain unbelief. Thus we find that Rationalism, with the example and the experience of all past forms of unbelief, has narrowed the issue to the denial of the single point, Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. But we have already discovered that the rejection of dogmatic systems as grounds of human belief, and the acceptance of the New Testament as the only guide of men, has led them to the affirmation of this as the fountain of light and life.

But, that we may understand the meaning of this issue, appreciate its magnitude, and see the relation which all parties sustain to it, let us study it from another stand-point. The literature of Rationalism is, to this time, directed to the solution of a single question. That question was asked by the Savior himself. Without any perversion of its meaning, we may conceive it as still being asked, and in the process of being answered. When first propounded, it contemplated two classes of mankind, each having its own answer, Whom MEN said, and whom his *disciples.* Now, if we substitute Rationalists for *men,* in the first, and Protestants and Romanists, professed Christians, for disciples, in the second of these classes, we have the stand-point mentioned. Then, if we consider the living utterances of all men in this generation as their reply to this question, it sinks all others into insignificance. When it is considered that every man's life, by a fixed law of his moral being, takes the form which his conscience gives it, and his conscience, by the same law, receives its type from his faith, since it is true that he thinks, feels, lives as he believes, then it must be seen that the real answer which any honest man renders to this question will determine his whole future. When, therefore, the Son of God demands a reply to the question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am," he asks a life question, which, whatever may be the answer, is the announcement of the principle on which the life will proceed; that by which the character will be measured when it is complete. It would be impossible, in a paper like this, to represent the answers of individual Rationalists to this question; for, as in the days when Jesus came to Cesarea Philippi, some said one thing and some another, so *men* now differ in their

opinions of Jesus; yet, we may approach near enough to a general reply to answer our present purposes. It is generally admitted that there is a narrow basis of historical truth on the human side of his life. His birth of humble parentage; his life in Galilee; the extraordinary spiritual beauty of his character; his great power as a teacher of moral truth; his violent death at Jerusalem; that he was this, but only this. He died as a man, and sleeps in the tomb as Socrates, Plato, and Seneca sleep. If this be assumed as the true reply to the question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" what will be the corresponding life? We may, at least, tell some things which it will not be. Having divested him of his divine authority as a teacher, who will any longer sit at his feet? Having disrobed him of his priesthood, who will bring his heart, however stricken by sin and broken by sorrow, to his altar? Having sealed his tomb forever, who, with Peter and John, will hasten, on the first day of the week, to see the place where the Lord lay, and to have his hopes kindled by angel voices, saying, "He is not here; he is risen"? Having deprived him of his glorified life, who any longer will walk with him to Olivet and see humanity, in him, glorified; going, not downward to the grave, but upward to the sky? Or who, lingering here with these Galileans, amidst the ruins of such a life as this, will any longer find an answer to the angel's question, "Why stand ye gazing up into heaven"? Such is the practical effect of the answer which men are rendering to this question.

We may, now, conceiving the membership of the Catholic and Protestant Churches as his disciples, and the other part of the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" as directly put to them, consider their reply. We class them together because the answer of Catholic and Protestant alike is based upon the same principle. The reply, already anticipated in this essay, has been given, printed, and subscribed before the world. In substance it is this: we say that you are the ground of our theological systems. We have formulated you into these articles of belief; what we say, therefore, may be found in our respective creeds. In these you have the answers which we have given and are still giving to your question, "Whom say ye that I am?" We have no inclination to pain the mind of the reader by quoting from these creeds the decayed and repulsive abstractions which they affirm to represent the nature of Christ. The boldness of the attempt

to put the life of "God manifest in the flesh" into a formula made up by the human mind, excites our amazement in this age. It will be sad enough to think of the practical effects of this answer, as seen in the life of Christendom. Truthfully could these parties say to the Lord Jesus, By these formulas we have been able to gauge with precision the differences of religious opinion. Each party can know exactly how widely the dogmas of the others differ from its own; and when they have cast out as evil the names of those who have failed to see the value or the truth of their doctrines, and have deprived them, as far as possible, of the affection and fellowship of Christian men, they have been able to find their justification in these formulas.

With these facts before us, we may now open the four Gospels and interrogate the teaching of Jesus for the answer which he was seeking when he first asked the question. It will scarcely be called in question, when, from the lives of Christ, written by inspired men, we affirm that he made with mankind *a single issue.* He said to the world, "I am the Christ, the Son of the living God." When the Apostle Peter gave this as the faith of his heart, his confession was immediately crowned with the fullness of Divine approval by the utterance of his own "Blessed art thou;" and then he added, "*This is whom my Father says I am.* Flesh and blood (men) do not say this, but the Infinite Father does; you have learned this from him." *Jesus must be this to men, or he is nothing.* Before the ages he must stand or fall upon this issue, and this alone. The acceptance of this is the acceptance of all. The denial of this is the denial of all. This, therefore, is incontestably *the living issue* of the age. Jesus says, "I am the Christ;" Rationalism says, he is not. If, now, we inquire what must be the practical result of the answer rendered by the four Gospels to the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" it will be seen at once, and, we think, admitted, by every one who can trace the plainest moral effect to its cause. If an honest man, as a real transaction of the soul, submit his mind to the Great Teacher, to be "taught by him as the truth is in Jesus;" if he bring his heart in the full consciousness of its wants, to the altar of his sacrifice; if he surrender his will to his law as the rule of his life, then this is simply to become a Christian; and this is to receive him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God." Now, let us note the practical effects of the three answers as they are actually being rendered in

the life of the world. The effect of the first, as we have seen, is to make men infidel; of the second, to make them religious partisans; of the third, to make them Christian.

Neither Romanism nor Protestantism has ever made this a distinctive issue with men. Rome, in her very organization, virtually abandoned it, by building upon Peter. Hence, in all her controversies with the world, this issue has scarcely been thought of. The infallibility of the Pope or of the Church, apostolic succession, and the dogmas of councils, have received vastly the largest part of her interest. The Messiahship of Jesus, in the interest which it has elicited, is infinitesimal in comparison with that of the least of her dogmas. When we examine the history of Protestantism, with reference to this question, we find the same fact is equally true. Protestants, in their controversies with Rome and with each other, have thought mostly of their doctrines. It is true, they have not denied the grand issue at which we have been looking; but, it is equally true, they have in no real sense affirmed it. Let any candid mind, after a survey of each of the great Protestant movements, ask himself upon what grounds has it based its claim to the faith of men; which has built itself upon the central question of the four Gospels; which has inscribed it upon its banner; made it the measure of its faith; which has gone before the world to stand or fall upon it; which has required an acknowledgment of it from every man in order to membership; would he not be compelled to say not one, no, not one? Rationalists, numbering among them, as they do, men whose minds have been trained to think by the utmost cultivation, and unincumbered by the defense of authoritative opinions, have, at last, discovered the unguarded part of the fortress, and leaving Romanists and Protestants to watch their unimportant positions, have concentrated their heaviest guns upon this. They have betaken themselves to writing lives of Christ. In the most refined spirit of gentleness and candor, they have thrown around the few facts of his life admitted by them, all the charms of elegant, graceful composition; while the great facts of his history, upon which he claims to be the teacher of man, the high-priest of human nature, and the king from whose law there is no appeal, are either explained away, ignored, or plainly denied. The question that ought to arrest the attention of all sincere men is, Who now is in a position to meet the attack of unbelief?

When it is said that Jesus is not "the Christ, the Son of the living God," who is facing the issue? The mental training which creeds have handed down from generation to generation, impressed by parents as a sacred duty upon the minds of children barely out of the cradle, has inevitably disqualified men for meeting the attack of unbelief in its present form. It has been observed by many writers, and deplored, that both Romanists and Protestants have shown themselves unprepared for the issue as it now stands. They are not even looking toward it. Can any living mind conjecture what the question of the operation of the Holy Spirit without means—the regeneration of infants, or the use of robes and wax candles in reading prayers and brief sermons—has to do with meeting the most cultivated and powerful intellects in Christendom in their attacks on the great vital issue of the Christian religion? And yet, upon the decision of this issue rests the religious well-being of the next generation. Our children will believe that Jesus is the Christ, and be Christian; or they will disbelieve it, and be infidel.

We have seen that in the first quarter of our century a reaction from the dogmas of Protestantism, as Protestantism itself was a reaction from those of Romanism, led to the organization of a Church based upon a recognition of the official relations of Jesus Christ to the world. Guided by the Word of God exclusively, they received him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God," making him, in contrast with the doctrines of creeds, the ground of their faith, their love, and their life. We have also noticed the course of unbelieving thought narrowing down its controversy with Christianity to this single issue. We have observed, too, that while Roman Catholic and the Protestant sects may have implied this issue in their authoritative formulas of doctrine, they have failed to make a distinctive issue, and to affirm it. On the contrary, they continue to throw the whole weight of their opposition against those who do. From the standpoint which we have now reached, the intelligent reader will be able to define the relation to the great living issue of the time, of all the parties now striving to gain the faith of men. Several weighty results follow the position taken, only one of which our proposed limits will permit us to notice. It is worthy of reverent and thankful attention to observe how that all-wise, overruling Providence, that makes all things work together for good, is making the unbelief of

the present the source of a deeper faith in Christ, and a higher Christian civilization for the future. Certainly, we may believe that there are very many true-hearted men, not too much enslaved to hereditary dogmatism, men who love the Christ, who will be forced, by the crisis of religious thought through which we are passing, to face the true issue, and to take a position from which a defense of Christianity is possible. It is not impossible that future generations will feel more indebted to such men as Strauss, Renan, Buckle, Lecky, and the author of "Ecce Homo" for the establishment of the faith of Christ, than to all the influences of Romanism and Protestantism combined. Christianity has in no period of her history held a position from which she had so much to hope. Rarely, if ever, has she found her opposers in a position which she could strike with such advantage; while placing herself on the one issue which her Author makes with the world, affords her an opportunity to test the loyalty of her professed friends to her superlative claims. Those who love the Christ more than they do party, will not hesitate to rally to her defense. Those who do not, will sink into a deeper and narrower sectarianism, and, perhaps, linger on in a chronic state between life and death, as some are already doing. He that hath the love of God and his truth in his heart, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly, but from him that hath not, the little capacity to be elevated into true Christian manhood will soon perish and vanish away. In the inspired grouping of the discourses of the Savior by Matthew, it is not without the most pointed significance that discerning the signs of the times has been placed in connection with the answer demanded of the disciples to the question we have been considering. The men of that generation who led religious thought, possessed remarkable sagacity in reading the phenomena of nature; but the phenomenon of the ages, the signs of the times, they could not see. The crisis of an age is the decision of the question which preceding centuries has delivered into its hands for solution, and upon which depends the life of succeeding generations; and, perhaps, the highest achievement of the intelligence of a generation is the conscious possession and mastery of the ground-question of its time, "Whoso is wise will observe these things; even they shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord."

III.—HARMONY OF THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE.

IN treating of this subject, I invite the attention of the reader to the brief consideration of the following propositions:

I. *The Bible was not given to mankind to instruct them in any system or department of science; but simply for the purpose of revealing to them a system of religion that is divinely adapted to the wants and circumstances of all.*

For the proof of this, I need only refer the reader to the Bible itself. A very superficial acquaintance with its contents is sufficient to satisfy any one that Jesus Christ is himself the Alpha and the Omega of all that is revealed to us in the Living Oracles. And hence it is said, in Revelation xix, 10: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Compare John xx, 31.

It is not, therefore, to be regarded as a defect in the Bible that it does not instruct us in the best modes of farming; the best systems of civil government, finance, and education; and the best ways and means of discovering and appropriating all that God has laid up in store for us in the kingdoms of nature. We do not regard it as a defect in the microscope that it does not reveal to us the magnitude, laws, and peculiar treasures of unseen worlds; nor of the telescope, that it does not portray to our imperfect vision the ten thousand times ten thousand animalculæ that sport unseen in the various fluids that lie both within and around us. No sane man finds fault with a rail-car, because it does not transport him across the ocean; nor with the telegraph, because it does not enable him to converse with the inhabitants of other worlds. It is enough that every art, and science, and instrument has its own specific object, its own proper range and sphere of usefulness. So long as it serves the purpose for which it was intended, no one has a right to complain. The practical mathematician has constant use for the rules of algebra and the demonstrations of geometry. But he would be a poor moralist or metaphysician who would, like Comte, attempt to introduce mathematics into the region of psychology, and measure the wants and capacities of the human soul by the fluxions of Sir Isaac Newton.

In like manner, the Bible has its object: an object which lies partly within and also immeasurably beyond the scope and limits of all finite reason. So far as it respects this one end and object, we have reason to expect that all in the Bible should be perfect; that there should be no deficiency in any of its provisions, nor any want of adaptation between means and ends. But for any want of instruction on other matters, the Bible is not responsible.

II. *In giving to mankind this revelation of his will, it has pleased God to make it through the same imperfect media by means of which they were then accustomed to communicate to each other their own thoughts, affections, and desires.*

To do this, or to impart to all men throughout all time, the gift of inspiration was a necessity. There was no other conceivable alternative. If the scheme of justification by faith was to be revealed to mankind at all, in order to faith, then indeed it follows, of necessity, either that God should give it to the world as he has done, by inspiring a few persons to communicate it to others as perfectly as possible through the medium of their own imperfect vernacular; or otherwise, that he should give it to all men by direct inspiration, as he did to the apostles and prophets. The last method would certainly have had some apparent advantages; and many may think that, on the whole, it would have been preferable to the plan which has been adopted. But this is a subject too high for us. No finite mind is capable of solving such a problem. Many other matters in the Divine administration seem equally strange to us. Why, for instance, did not God at first give to all men a perfect language? Why did he not, by inspiration, make known to the ancient patriarchs, and through them to their posterity, all the useful arts, sciences, and inventions which are now filling the world with their refining and elevating influences? Why were men left to work out so many important results for themselves? To these, and a thousand other similar questions, the best and most satisfactory answer that can be given is simply this: *God so willed it.* He alone understands the beginning and the end of all things; and what, in all cases and under all circumstances, is most for his own glory and the good of his creatures. Whenever, therefore, God speaks, human reason should be silent. The highest prerogative of the finite is to simply acquiesce in the decrees of the Infinite. Whatever God does is

right. And hence we have no doubt that the plan of inspiring a few men to communicate the Gospel to others through the medium of their own imperfect vernacular, was the very best that could have been adopted under the circumstances. To have substituted the technical language of modern science for the common dialects of the masses would have been barbarous in the extreme. The true philosopher stoops to instruct as well as to conquer.

III. *The Bible is not, therefore, responsible for any deficiency in the means and media of its communications.*

The missionary who goes to India for the purpose of preaching to the natives Jesus Christ and him crucified, often finds it necessary to refer to their false notions of philosophy, and to use even their idolatrous nomenclature, as the very best possible means of imparting to them a knowledge of the true God, and of the only way and means of pardon for guilty men. And just so it was with the Holy Spirit when it first came on its mission of love to earth. Its object was not to create a new language, nor to frame new systems of philosophy; but simply to communicate to mankind, in the best possible way, God's scheme of grace and benevolence. And hence we find that it generally spoke in the language, style, and dialect of the common people. This I will endeavor to illustrate by a few examples.

From the beginning of the world to the time of Copernicus, it was the generally received opinion that the earth is the immovable center of the universe; and that the sun, moon, and stars are set as lights in the concave arch of the firmament, and in some mysterious way make their daily revolutions from east to west. And hence the Holy Spirit, in perfect harmony with the tenor and object of its mission, spoke of the sun as "*rising*," "*setting*," "*going down*," "*standing still*," etc. Ages rolled on, but the dialect of the people, with regard to astronomical phenomena, was unchanged. None but some daring genius, such as Pythagoras and a few of his followers, ever presumed to call into question its literal correctness; and in the second century of the Christian era, Ptolemy, of Alexandria, wrote a treatise on the *Geocentric Theory* of astronomy, which, for fifteen hundred years, was the astronomical text-book of Christendom. But in the sixteenth century, the great work of Copernicus on the *Heliocentric Theory* of astronomy was published to the world. It was at once received and publicly defended by Giordano Bruno and a few others; and early in

the seventeenth century, the discoveries of Galileo aroused all Christendom. The Pope and his cardinals became alarmed. Copernicus, though dead, was proclaimed to be a heretic; Bruno was burned at the stake, and Galileo was twice forced to abjure his philosophical opinions, and to subscribe to the *Geocentric Theory* of astronomy, which was at that time generally regarded as the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. But as learning revived, and the laws and principles of Sacred Hermeneutics became better understood, it was generally conceded that the Bible is not committed to any theory of astronomy; that the Holy Spirit had a higher mission than to decide on the correctness or incorrectness of astronomical hypotheses; and that it simply used the formulæ of speech then current among the people as a means of communicating to mankind the Gospel of the grace of God just as astronomers now use the same formulæ for the purpose of communicating their ideas to the uneducated masses. And hence no one now objects to the Bible on the ground that it indorses the geocentric theory of astronomy.

I might still further illustrate the truth of this proposition by considering the notions of the Hebrews about the firmament; about the shape and dimensions of the earth; about sheol, the place of departed spirits; about the viscera as the seat of the affections, etc. But I think that enough has been said to satisfy all candid and reasonable inquirers after truth, that the Holy Spirit is in no way chargeable with the errors and defects that may appear in the *media* of its communications; and that it is only when the phenomena, laws, and forces of nature are referred to or stated as *ultimate facts*, that we have a right to expect and require that the statements be made with absolute accuracy.

IV. *It is important, also, to remember that until we understand the Bible perfectly, and Nature perfectly, seeming contradictions and inconsistencies are constantly liable to arise from our own ignorance.*

But this much no living man yet understands. The first chapter of Genesis is still very differently interpreted, by even the most learned scholars of the nineteenth century. And the same is true of many other portions of the Bible. True, indeed, the way of duty is very clearly and distinctly marked out on its sacred pages; but, beneath and on either side of this way, there are depths which even the archangel has never sounded. And hence it is that almost every

year now serves to modify, in some way, and to some extent, the formerly received laws and principles of Sacred Hermeneutics.

And this is true, to even a much greater extent, of the book of nature. If we except the single department of pure mathematics, where can we find the science that has not been variously changed and modified by the progress of knowledge within the last five, ten, fifteen, or twenty years? Where is it? Where are the text-books of Chemistry, Mineralogy, Botany, Zoölogy, Geology, Physiology, Natural Philosophy, Astronomy, Psychology, Moral Philosophy, and Political Economy, that were regarded as standard works in our best colleges twenty-five years ago? The progress of knowledge, within even this short period, has rendered most of them obsolete; and many of their hypotheses, once received and regarded as scientific truths, have vanished before the light of science, as darkness before the rising sun of the morning.

And what, after all our vain boasting, do we really yet know of science? What is matter, and what is spirit, and what is their bond of union? What is light? what is heat? what is electricity? and what is magnetism? What is life, and what is death? How do the grasses grow, the flowers bloom, and the tender buds bring forth, from the same elements, so great a variety of precious fruits? What is the distance to the most brilliant of the fixed stars, and what are the dimensions of this universe? How many worlds does it contain, and what is the number, and what the character of their inhabitants? To all these, and ten thousand times ten thousand other questions, Science gives no definitive answer. She yet knows but in part, and that, too, in a very small part. She has scarcely yet mastered the alphabet of the book of nature. But, nevertheless, she sometimes puts on airs, and talks as haughtily and as dogmatically as if she were endowed with the attribute of Omniscience. I speak, now, of Science falsely so-called. True Science is always modest, and, like her illustrious patron, Sir Isaac Newton, is always willing and ready to acknowledge that the great ocean of truth lies before her yet unexplored.

It would be marvelous then, indeed, if, knowing as little as we do of the Bible, and still far less of nature, there should not occasionally arise, in the course of our very limited researches, some apparent discrepancies in the sublime teachings of these two wonderful

volumes. But, in such cases, there is no cause of alarm; and nothing is gained by either ecclesiastical or scientific intolerance. Let all lovers of truth patiently and calmly work on, feeling assured that in the end Religion and Science will mutually embrace each other as loving sisters of the same Divine parentage.

V. *Notwithstanding this constant liability to meet with apparent discrepancies between Divine revelation and the book of nature, it is gratifying to know that the more profound study of both has always served to remove all seeming contradictions, and that so far as these two volumes are now well understood, there is between them the most perfect harmony.*

In illustrating this proposition, I will consider,

I. The Epoch of Creation.

Previous to the beginning of the nineteenth century, it was the common opinion of most Biblical critics, that the world was created about six thousand years ago; some alleging that all the rocks, stratified and unstratified, were created just as they are; while others were of the opinion that the stratified rocks, with their numerous fossils, were produced partly by secondary antediluvian causes, and partly by the agency of the Noachic deluge. But, as geologists progressed with their investigations, it became evident that the aforesaid theological hypothesis was untenable, and that the earth must have been in existence for a much longer period than six thousand years. It was, moreover, further ascertained, with a good degree of probability:

1. That the earth was, at first, in a state of igneous fusion, and that the oldest unstratified rocks (granite) were produced by the gradual cooling of its surface.

2. That all other unstratified rocks, such as syenite, porphyry, greenstone, trachite, basalt, etc., have been produced in like manner, by the cooling of the original lava; and hence they are all called *igneous* rocks.

3. That the stratified rocks have been formed in water. After the primitive earth was sufficiently cooled to permit the condensed vapor to rest as water on its surface, the process of disintegration would at once commence, owing to the constant agitation of these waters by volcanic action. In this way the original granite, mixed with other substances, would be formed into gneiss, mica slate, marble, talcose slate, hornblende slate, quartz, clay slate, etc.

4. During this primitive period the whole earth was too intensely hot to allow any living thing to remain on its surface; and, hence, the rocks deposited during that period are called *azoic* rocks. But, as ages rolled on, the surface became cooler, and vegetables and animals were then created. Those of the first age were all *marine*, and generally of the lowest orders. They are first found in the Silurian formation.

5. How long the Silurian age lasted we have no certain means of knowing. That it was of long duration, however, is evident from the immense thickness of the rocks that were then deposited. But, when all the agencies then employed had fulfilled their mission, the fountains of the great deep were broken up; all living animals and vegetables were destroyed, and the whole surface of the earth was again thrown into a state of chaos.

6. After this, the Divonian age was ushered in, and new species of animals and plants were created to serve as ministers of God in preparing the earth for the abode of man. These fulfilled their mission, and the earth was again broken up, and all living species destroyed, preparatory to the work of the Carboniferous age. To this again succeeded, in order, the Permian, the Triassic, the Lias, the Oolite, the Wealden, the Chalk, the Tertiary, the Drift, and the Alluvium.

How many of these ages, with their separate and distinct formations of stratified rock, have occurred since the epoch of creation, is uncertain. On this point geologists are not agreed. But we are assured by President Hitchcock, "*that there were on the globe, previous to the existing races, not less than five distinct periods of organized existence;* that is, five great groups of animals and plants, so completely independent of each other, that no species whatever is found in more than one of them, lived and successively passed away before the creation of the races that now occupy the surface. Other standard writers make the number of these periods of existence as many as twelve. Comparative Anatomy testifies that so unlike in structure were these different groups, that they could not have co-existed in the same climate and other external circumstances."*

These were stubborn facts. They were indelibly stereotyped on the whole surface of the earth; on its loftiest mountains as well as

* Religion of Geology, p. 22.

in its deepest valleys. What, then, was to be done? For a time, infidels rejoiced, and many of the more feeble advocates of Divine revelation trembled. But the more learned and thoughtful were undisturbed. They well knew in whom and also in what they had believed; but, nevertheless, they thought it quite possible that they might have misinterpreted Moses in this case as their fathers had done before them, in the discussion of the great astronomical problem; and they therefore resolved on a more critical exegesis of the first chapter of Genesis. It was done, and the problem was soon solved. From a critical examination of the Hebrew text, they saw, with Justin Martyr, Origen, Augustine, and some other Christian fathers, that Moses does not fix or determine the epoch of creation; that there is really no connection between the first and second verses of Genesis; and that, as Luther once said, without having any reference to geology, "*there should be drawn a very broad black line between them.*" They saw, moreover, that the work of each day is introduced by the very significant phrase, "*And God said.*" And hence they inferred that the first two verses of Genesis describe events that must have occurred previous to the first day.

The problem was now more than half solved. It only remained to reconcile with this exegesis the known facts of geology. This was easily done. To such men as Dr. Thomas Chalmers and others of enlarged minds and liberal education, it now seemed evident,

1. That the first verse of Genesis describes creation absolute: the original generation of all the materials of the entire physical universe.

2. That the second verse has reference to the chaotic state of the earth after the last general breaking up of its surface just before the beginning of the Adamic renovation. "The earth was then wasteness and emptiness, and darkness was on the face of the abyss; and the Spirit of God was brooding on the face of the waters."

3. That between these two epochs, given in the first and second verses of Genesis, as many ages may have occurred as will satisfy all the demands of natural science. But to describe these was no part of the work of Moses.

4. That when the fullness of time was come, God introduced the *Historic Period*, or Adamic era, by his own omnipotent fiat, as recorded in the third verse of Genesis. "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light."

5. And, finally, that the entire work of fitting up the earth for the use, comfort, and happiness of man, was accomplished within the brief space of six ordinary days of twenty-four hours each; and that on the seventh day of the same length, God rested from all his works. Compare Exodus xx, 8–11.*

Thus it was that Religion and Science once more met together, and that Nature and Revelation again mutually embraced and sustained each other.

This discussion touching the epoch of creation throws some light on sundry other points of much interest to the student. Such, for instance, as the following:

1. That all things, save God, had a beginning. This fact is repeatedly declared in the Holy Scriptures. And though the testimony of Nature is not conclusive with regard to this point, it nevertheless certainly all leans in the same direction. The natural history of the earth carries us back to a time when there were no animals, no plants, no rocks, no soils; nothing, indeed, but inert matter in a state of igneous fusion. If it could go a step further and utter even one more articulate sound, would it not be to simply announce the creation of the material universe in harmony with the sublime oracle of the first verse of Genesis?

* It may be a satisfaction to some of my readers to know that several other modes of reconciling the known facts of geology with the Mosaic account of creation have been proposed and supported by men distinguished alike for their love of the Bible and their scientific attainments. Such, for instance, are the following:

I. That the six days of creation in the Mosaic account are not literal days of twenty-four hours each; but long periods of indefinite and unequal length. Advocated by Hugh Miller, Professor Silliman, Professor Dana, etc.

II. That each of these demiurgic days stands as the closing day and *representative* of a long and indefinite period. Advocated by Bishop Horsley, Professor Jameson, etc.

III. That in the Mosaic account we have a sort of pictorial representation of the progressive work of creation, just as we have in the Apocalypse a pictorial presentation of the fortunes and destiny of the Church. Supported by Dr. Knapp and most allegorical interpreters.

IV. That the narrative of the six days' work has no reference to the original creation of the earth, nor even to its general renovation; but merely to the fitting up of *a portion of its surface* for the use of man. Advocated by Dr. John Pye Smith.

These theories, the reader will observe, are all supported by the authority of great and illustrious names. But, nevertheless, I have no hesitation in preferring the mode of reconciliation given in our text. This hypothesis, advocated in the main by Chalmers, Harris, King, Hitchcock, etc., seems to harmonize perfectly with both the facts of geology and the Mosaic narrative. For myself, I can not, on this hypothesis, see even the appearance of any discrepancy between the testimony of the rocks and the record of Moses.

2. That man was created at a comparatively late period. The time, as given by Moses, was about six thousand years ago; and with this statement agree all the *known facts* of geology. "No human remains," says President Hitchcock, "have been found below those alluvial deposits which are now forming by rivers, lakes, and the ocean. Hence geology infers that man was one of the latest animals that was placed on the globe."*

3. That God ordinarily works by means of second causes, as far as these can be made to serve his purposes. But when they are not sufficient, he then works miraculously; then he himself speaks, and it is done; he commands, and it stands fast. Of the truth of this we have, in the testimony of Nature as well as in the testimony of the Bible, very clear and convincing evidence. So far as these two witnesses give any testimony on this point, it is to the effect that there is no such thing as either "*spontaneous generation*" or the "*transmutation of species;*" but that all kinds of both animals and plants owe their origin to the creative fiat of Omnipotence.

II. Creation of Light.

To the Mosaic account of the creation of light, given in the third verse of Genesis, infidels have filed two objections. It is opposed, say they,

I. To astronomy, because it represents light as having been created before the sun. And,

II. To geology, because we are taught by this science that light existed many ages before the Adamic epoch. It seems clear, from the Testimony of the Rocks, that animals having eyes lived during even the Silurian and Divonian ages. But the existence of an eye always implies the contemporaneous existence of light.

How, then, are these objections to be met, and the harmony of Science and the Bible again vindicated?

To do this, in the present imperfect state of optical science, may be very difficult, perhaps, indeed, impossible. Before such a demand can be reasonably made of us, it should first be demonstrated what light is, what are its laws, and what are its properties. But these are still matters of inquiry with even many of our ablest philosophers.

* Religion of Geology, p. 23; also Lyell's Prin. Geol., vol. 1, pp. 249, 282.

It is now, however, pretty generally conceded,

1. That every planet is surrounded with an extremely fine and subtile fluid called "*luminiferous ether.*"*

2. That it is the peculiar property of the sun and other luminous bodies to cause this ether to vibrate with almost inconceivable rapidity.

3. That through the influence of these vibrations on the optic nerve, light is produced, very much as sound is produced by the vibrations of the atmosphere on the tympanum of the ear. And hence this is called the *undulatory* or *waving theory* of light.†

Now, if this hypothesis is true, it is not difficult to reconcile all the known facts and phenomena of optical science with the teachings of Moses. For we may certainly assume, with a very high degree of probability,

1. That the sun was *created*, with all other parts of the material universe, "in the beginning." (Genesis i, 1.)

2. That there was light during the pre-Adamic ages. But, as the light, temperature, etc., of those times were not, according to Comparative Anatomy, well suited to existing species, the luminiferous ether of those primitive ages was like the pre-Adamic atmosphere, absorbed in the general changes and convulsions which occurred just before the beginning of the Historic Period. If so, terrestrial darkness was, of course, the immediate effect.

3. That, on the first day, when God said "Let there be light," he simply reproduced the luminiferous ether, as he did the atmosphere on the day following. In that event, the whole hemisphere, next to the sun, would be at once illuminated.

*It is the opinion of most philosophers that this ether is universally diffused. But of this, the evidence is by no means satisfactory; and, as every planet has its own atmosphere, it is more probable that it has, also, its own *luminiferous ether*, specially adapted to the peculiar wants and circumstances of its own varied tenantry.

†The *corpuscular theory* of Sir Isaac Newton, beautiful as it was, has, nevertheless, proved to be defective, and it is, therefore, now very generally abandoned by our ablest natural philosophers. And this, ere long, may also be the fate of the undulatory theory. The history of science is largely made up of an account of theories and hypotheses which, like so many brilliant meteors, glowed and dazzled for a while, and then perished forever. "On the one subject of Geology," says Mr. A. Barnes, in his lectures on the "Evidences of Christianity in the Nineteenth Century," p. 89, "so early as the year 1806, the French Institute counted more than eighty theories hostile to Scripture history, not one of which has stood to the present day."

How true it is that "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory and speculations of men are but as the flowers of the grass. The grass withereth, and the flowers thereof fade away, but THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURES FOREVER!"

4. That, on the fourth day, probably, when the clouds and vapors were all dispersed, and the sun, moon, and stars were for the first time made visible from the surface of the earth, God assigned to these heavenly bodies their office as our time-keepers. This is all that is really implied in the words of Moses. It is not said in the text that they were then *created*. God simply then *made* (*ahsah*) them our chronometers, just as he made the rainbow a sign of the Noachic covenant, and as he made David a king over Israel.*

If this explanation is not satisfactory to the skeptical objector, we promise to do better whenever he will demonstrate to us what is the true theory and philosophy of light. In the mean time it is gratifying to know that, so far as the science of optics is understood, there is really no discrepancy whatever between it and the narrative of Moses.

III. Extent of the Noachic Deluge.

It has long been a standing objection with infidels, that science is irreconcilably opposed to the Mosaic account of the Noachic deluge. Moses, say they, clearly teaches not only that the flood was universal,

*I have given here what, on the whole, seems to me to be the most satisfactory solution of this very difficult and complicated problem. But it is, perhaps, due to the reader to say that several other methods of reconciling the narrative of Moses with the science of Optics have been advocated by men of the highest attainments in both Natural Science and Sacred Literature. The most plausible of these may be stated as follows. It claims:

1. That the sun, moon, and stars were all created "in the beginning."

2. That the same luminiferous ether has existed from the beginning; and that it most likely pervades all space.

3. That Moses describes things *phenomenally;* that is, as they would have appeared to a spectator on the surface of the earth,

4. That, on the beginning of the first day, which was evening, the atmosphere was so filled with dense fogs and vapors, that no light from the sun could penetrate it. All on the surface of the earth was in absolute darkness; but, as the earth revolved on its axis, God caused so much of the vapor to be precipitated from the atmosphere as to permit the light to shine through the fogs and mists which still rested on the surface of the earth, and thus was produced the first morning.

5. That the same atmosphere also existed, most likely, from the beginning; but that, after the last great cataclysm antecedent to the Adamic renovation, it was completely filled with vapor, as it sometimes now is on a very foggy morning, till the second day, when, by another fiat, God rendered the lower part of it perfectly *transparent*, and thus separated the waters which were above the firmament from the waters which were below the firmament.

6. That dense clouds covered the face of the sky till the fourth day, when God removed the veil, and caused the sun, moon, and stars to appear in their full-orbed glories in the heavens. Then it was that they were, by Divine appointment, set apart as our chronometers, and made to rule our days, and months, and years.

Of these two hypotheses, the reader may take his choice. Perhaps they both express part of the truth as it was revealed to Moses by inspiration.

but, also, that it rose fifteen cubits above the tops of the highest mountains. But Science teaches us that this is impossible. And, hence, they allege that there is here a direct conflict between Science and Revelation.

To this objection two answers have been given by Christian philosophers.

I. *That Moses, fairly interpreted, does not teach that the deluge was universal.* And

II. *That though he does clearly and unmistakably affirm its universality, he, nevertheless, affirms nothing that is impossible or inconsistent with science.*

These positions have been severally maintained by men of the highest repute for both their scientific and Biblical attainments; and the subject under consideration may, therefore, be justly regarded rather as a question of Biblical interpretation than of Biblical and scientific harmony. But, nevertheless, as its discussion will serve to remove doubts, and at the same time to illustrate some of the fundamental laws of Sacred Hermeneutics, I will briefly consider some of the main points involved in this very interesting controversy.

The language of Moses, taken literally, proves, beyond all doubt, that the deluge was universal. See Genesis vii, 19–23, and ix, 8–17. And so, also, do the words of Peter in the third chapter of his second Epistle. This much is conceded by all parties. And, as it is a fundamental rule of interpretation that "all words must be taken in their literal sense unless it can be shown that, for reasons clear and satisfactory, they should be construed figuratively," the presumption is in favor of the old hypothesis, that the deluge was universal, and the burden of proof falls on those who would limit it to a portion of the earth's surface.

This is also conceded by all who have any respect for the authority of Divine Revelation; such, for instance, as Dr. John Pye Smith, Hugh Miller, President Edward Hitchcock, and many others, eminent for their piety as well as for their scientific attainments. These gentlemen willingly assume the "*onus probandi*," and proceed to maintain their ground by such arguments as the following: They allege

I. That the distributive terms *all, whole, each, every*, etc., are often used in a restricted sense, in both sacred and profane literature. It

is said, for instance, in Genesis xli, 57, that "*all countries* came into Egypt, to Joseph, to buy corn; because the famine was sore in *all lands*." Besides, it is a well-known fact that the Chaldeans, Medo-Persians, Greeks, and Romans were all wont to speak of their several empires as co-extensive with the world; and hence it follows that it would be very absurd to interpret the *geographical* terms of the Bible, and other books of like antiquity, as if they were directly addressed to an enlightened audience of the nineteenth century. These, like many other words in the Bible, have a *historical* meaning, and should always be interpreted according to the circumstances under which they were written or spoken.

This reasoning is all very just, so far as it goes. It proves beyond all doubt that these distributive terms *may* be used in a limited sense, and that if the revelations and developments of Science should render such an interpretation of the Mosaic account of the deluge necessary, the Bible would not suffer any more from it than it did from the astronomical demonstrations of Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, and Sir Isaac Newton. But, beyond this, the argument has no force. It does not follow that because these terms are used sometimes in a restricted sense, that they are, therefore, always so used. Such a conclusion would be wholly unwarranted by any and all the rules of sound logic.

II. They say that it is absurd to suppose that God would inundate the whole earth merely for the purpose of destroying a population that was confined, in all probability, to a small portion of Western Asia.

But here, it seems to me, there is an undue assumption of premises; for,

1. How do these men know that the antediluvian population was limited to a small part of Western Asia? If, in the course of seven generations, the posterity of Jacob amounted to about two and a half or three millions of people, what might not the posterity of Adam have become in the space of 1,656 years?

2. Are they perfectly sure that God had no other object in view than simply to destroy the wicked antediluvians? Do not such facts as the great change which then took place in the period of human life, clearly indicate that at that time very great *physical changes* took place over the whole earth? And does it not, therefore, seem to

follow that at least one of God's main purposes in this tremendous cataclysm, was to better adapt this whole mundane system of things to the wants and circumstances of fallen man?

3. It seems probable, from 1 Peter iii, 20, 21, that the deluge had a *typical* as well as a *penal* design. The meaning of the passage seems to be this: that as the antitype baptism now saves us from the power, influence, and dominion of sin by introducing us into Christ, the only real ark of safety, so the waters of the deluge saved eight souls from, perhaps, both natural and spiritual death, by bringing them into the ark and putting a stop to the torrent of vice which had then covered the earth.

III. They allege that the ark was not of sufficient capacity to hold two of every species of unclean, and seven of every species of clean animals.

This is an argument of recent origin. It was very generally conceded, a few years ago, that the ark was large enough to contain two of every living species of birds and terrestrial animals. But naturalists have recently been very busy in multiplying the number of living species. In 1614, Sir Walter Raleigh estimated the number of existing mammal species at 89; in 1765, Buffon estimated them at 200; but they are now estimated, by Mr. Johnson and others, at about 1,658. This great increase in the number of living species, says Hugh Miller, is owing partly to discovery, and partly to greater scientific scrutiny. He says that Buffon, for instance, made the African and Asiatic elephants but one species, but now they are ascertained to be two.

This, then, would seem to be a very strong argument, if we could rely on the premises. But here, again, there is most likely an undue assumption. Many naturalists now affirm, with great confidence, that there are not less than fifteen or twenty species of the genus homo! but we have the best and highest authority for affirming that man is a *species* and not a *genus;* that God has, in fact, made of one blood all the nations of men that dwell on the face of the earth. (Acts xvii, 26.) It is, therefore, quite probable that other species have been unwarrantably multiplied in similar ratios.

IV. They allege that the present distribution of animals and plants is inconsistent with the universality of the deluge. Most naturalists reckon as many as fourteen zoölogical and twenty-five

botanical provinces on the present surface of the earth; and, hence, they infer that there were just so many original centers of creation, and that these were unaffected by the deluge.

But, would it require any more power *to distribute* animals, as we now find them, in their several provinces, than it did *to collect* them into the ark? (See Genesis vii, 14–16.) Besides, the same difficulty in kind, though, perhaps, not in degree, exists with regard to the distribution of the human species; but we know that they were all dispersed from Babel, as a common center. (Genesis xi.)

V. They allege that there is not a sufficient amount of water on the surface of the earth and in the atmosphere to produce a universal deluge. If the earth were reduced to a perfect sphere, and all existing waters were distributed equally over its surface, it is supposed that they would form an ocean of only about three or three and a half feet in depth.

This argument is plausible, and, to the natural man, it may seem to be quite conclusive. But we must remember:

1. That all things are possible with God. He may have effected all this chiefly by a miracle, and with just as much ease as Christ fed the five thousand men on five loaves and two fishes.

2. That we have the unequivocal testimony of the rocks, that many of the highest mountains of Europe, Asia, and America were, at a comparatively recent period, covered with water to such a depth that immense icebergs, loaded with huge masses of granite, gneiss, sand, etc., were carried quite over their summits, from the Arctic and Antarctic regions, toward the equator; producing, it would seem, a universal deluge. "The stones," says Professor Dana, "are of all dimensions, from that of a small pebble to masses as large as a moderate-sized house. One, at Bradford, in Massachusetts, is thirty feet each way, and its weight is estimated to be at least 4,500,000 pounds. Many, on Cape Cod, are twenty feet in diameter. One lying on a naked ledge at Whittingham, in Vermont, measures forty-three feet in length, and thirty in height and width, or, 40,000 cubic feet in bulk, and was probably transported across Deerfield valley, the bottom of which is 500 feet below the spot where it lies. . . . The distance to which the stones were transported, as learned by comparing them with the rocks in place to the north, is mostly between twenty and forty miles, though in some cases sixty miles or more.

. . . The rocky ledges over which the drift was borne are often *scratched* in closely crowded parallel lines. The scratchings or groovings are often deep and broad channelings, at times even a foot in depth, and several feet wide, as if made by a tool of great size as well as power. They are found in the valleys and on the slopes of mountains to a height, on the Green Mountains, of 5,000 feet."*

To these interesting facts may also be added the following from Hitchcock's Elementary Geology. The author says: "It is a characteristic of drift, by which it is distinguished from disintegrated rock, that it has been removed from its original position; it may be only a few rods, but more frequently a great many miles. And by the bowlders and trains of gravel and sand which it has left along the way, we can trace it back to its origin. . . . To begin with the American continent at the north-easterly point, where observations to be depended on have been made, we find that the bowlders spread over the southern part of Nova Scotia were derived from the ledges in the northern part of the province. Throughout the whole extent of Maine, the evidence is very striking of a southerly transport of the drift, the course being usually a few degrees east of south. And transported bowlders are even found toward the summit of Katahdin, which is 5,300 feet high. . . . According to Mr. Darwin, the equatorial regions of South America, especially the vast plains in the eastern parts, present few or no examples of transported bowlders or erratics. But beyond 41° south latitude, and near the Cordilleras, they show themselves in Chili and Patagonia. Sir Robert Schomberg has also described enormous far-transported blocks in British Guiana. Prof. Studer states that in the hill country at the foot of the Himmalaya Mountains, erratic bowlders occur. Close along the foot of these mountains, says Capt. Strachey, we find the soil to be everywhere composed of deposits of bowlders and gravel. This detritus may be the result of glaciers. And such may be also the origin of similar accumulations in the mountains south of Algiers in Africa."

Do not such facts serve very greatly to corroborate the Mosaic account of the deluge? Is it not most likely that the drift was the effect of those tremendous convulsions of nature which then shook this rock-ribbed earth from its center to its circumference? So it was once thought, says President Hitchcock, but this opinion, he

*Dana's Text-Book of Geology, pp. 220–222.

says, is now very generally abandoned by *geologists* for the following reasons:

1. "That water alone could not have produced the drift; immense icebergs were also necessary."

This may also be true of the deluge. Moses describes simply the *fact*, not the *means* by which it was produced. It is evident, however, that both natural and miraculous means were used.

2. "No remains of man, nor of his works, have been found in the drift; nor, indeed, till we rise almost to the top of the alluvial deposits."

This is just what we might anticipate, as the drift was carried from the uninhabited polar regions, and consisted chiefly of pre-Adamic formations.

3. "Many organic remains found in the alluvium, considerably above the drift, are of extinct species."

May not the upper part of the drift be often mistaken for alluvium? During the flood the large bowlders would, of course, be deposited first, then the smaller fragments of rocks, and, finally, the gravel and clay similar to alluvium.

4. "The agency producing the drift must have operated during a much longer period than 370 days."

This objection is based on the assumption that the deluge was brought on and continued merely by the force of natural causes, operating with their ordinary intensity. But this is not at all probable.

On the whole, then, I am constrained to think that the arguments given are not sufficient to set aside the literal interpretation of the aforesaid passages. It seems more reasonable to conclude, in the light of both Natural Science and Sacred Hermeneutics, that the Noachic deluge was universal; as the final conflagration will also be universal. But, whichever mode of interpretation is adopted, the student of the Bible may rest assured that there is here no more conflict between Natural Science and the Bible than there is between Natural Science and the testimony of every formation of the pre-Adamic earth. On these imperishable and rock-bound folios are inscribed the history of not only many deluges, but also of many other signs and wonders quite as marvelous as any thing that is recorded by Moses concerning the deluge of Noah. Here, then, is

firm ground, on which the Christian may ever repose with confidence. The infidel must either wholly ignore the unequivocal testimony of the Silurian, Divonian, Carboniferous, Permian, Triassic, Lias, Oolite, Wealden, and Cretaceous rocks, or he must concede that there is nothing in the Mosaic account of the deluge that is, in any way, inconsistent with God's previous workings in preparing the earth for the abode and happiness of man.

I might now pass from the Physical Sciences to the Metaphysical, and draw many arguments and illustrations, especially from the various departments of Pneumatology; but, perhaps, enough has already been said to satisfy every candid and thoughtful reader, and I will, therefore, close this chapter of evidence by simply stating a *fact*, which is really of more value than many arguments. It is briefly this: account for it as we may, it is, nevertheless, patent to all who have eyes to see, ears to hear, and hearts to understand, that *Christianity has always flourished most in the light, and with the progress of science.* It had its origin in the most enlightened part of the ancient world; during the dark ages it somewhat declined, but revived rapidly with the revival of literature and the progress of science in the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and now it has a stronger hold on the understanding and the affections of mankind than it ever had before during any period of the world's history.

How, then, is all this to be accounted for? It can not be truthfully said of any other system of religion or of religious philosophy ever given to the world. The religious systems of the ancient Greeks, Romans, Druids, Chaldeans, Persians, and Egyptians have all passed away; Mohammedanism is rapidly waning and vanishing before the rising and rapidly increasing splendors of the sun of science; and so, also, are Brahmanism and Buddhism. But Christianity is gaining power with every new discovery of truth; with every new development of science which really serves to emancipate and deliver mankind from the bondage and tyranny of ignorance, superstition, and crime, and which inclines them to regard and treat each other as free, moral, and responsible subjects of the moral government of Jehovah. Need we, then, any stronger evidence than this, to prove that the Author of the Book of Nature is also the Author of the Bible?

IV.—THE SPIRIT OF ROMANISM.

Aspirations of Nature. By I. T. HECKER. New York: James B. Kirker. 1859.

Symbolism; or, Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, as evidenced by their Symbolical Writings. By JOHN ADAM MOEHLER, D. D. Third Edition. New York: Catholic Publication House.

A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation. By the REV. GEORGE WADDINGTON, M. A. London: Baldwin & Craddock.

An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern; from the Birth of Christ to the beginning of the Eighteenth Century. By JOHN LAURENCE MOSHEIM, D. D. Cincinnati: Applegate & Co. 1855.

The History of Romanism, from the Earliest Corruptions of Christianity to the Present Time. By JOHN DOWLING, D. D. New York: Edward Walker. 1853.

The Roman Catholic Church and Free Thought: A Controversy between Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, and Thomas Vickers; together with the Encyclical Letter and Syllabus of Pope Pius IX, dated December 8, 1864. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co. 1868.

The Vickers and Purcell Controversy. By JOHN B. PURCELL, Archbishop of Cincinnati. New York and Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers. 1868.

THE ablest Roman Catholic authors in America insist upon re-opening the case of their Church. They assure us, with every appearance of earnestness, that the judgment pronounced by the public upon the spirit of Romanism, is contrary to both law and evidence; is authorized neither by its doctrines nor its history. They beg us to believe that Romanism, so far from antagonizing human freedom, as the non-Catholic world has hitherto, with singular unanimity, concluded, is, in fact, its truest friend and most constant supporter. They even go farther, and insist that Protestantism, by which *their* system has been adjudged in the wrong, is itself the guilty party, and obnoxious to the very charges upon which it has arraigned and condemned the holy Roman Church. In one word, they appeal from the tribunal of the past to that of the present.

An issue is thus formed, which makes it necessary to re-examine the whole case; to bring forward, once more, the evidences in which its merits are involved, and to give them a dispassionate and candid consideration. And if, indeed, it shall be found that the decision of

the past was hasty and unauthorized, or, that the Church has so far changed its attitude to the world as to render such decision no longer applicable, it will be a pleasure, no less than a duty, to make the *amende honorable.*

The party moving in the matter should be first heard; and among its advocates there is none more earnest, and few, we suppose, more able, than the author of the "Aspirations of Nature." On the subject of "Reason and Freedom" he expresses himself—assuming at the same time to represent the position of his Church—in the following language:

"Endowed with reason, man has no right to surrender his judgment. Endowed with free-will, man has no right to yield up his liberty. Reason and free-will constitute man a responsible being, and he has no right to abdicate his independence. Reason, Liberty, Independence, these are divine and inalienable gifts; and man can not renounce them if he would."

Again he says:

"Religion is a question between God and the soul. No human authority, therefore, has any right to enter its sacred sphere. The attempt is sacrilegious."

Yet once more:

"The age demands a religion which unites reverence for God, with a profound respect for the divinely-gifted intelligence and heaven-born freedom of man."

The boldness of these utterances can not be too much admired. Happily, too, their meaning is expressed with so much clearness that none can mistake it. The author perceives, as by the intuition of genius, that the age demands a religion which recognizes and respects the freedom of conscience; a religion which not only tolerates, but which encourages, the exercise of reason, of judgment, and of independence. And not only does he perceive it to be the demand of the age, but he acknowledges, with perfect frankness, that the demand is right. In other words, he holds that as no religion *will* be, so no religion *should* be accepted by this generation which is wanting in these characteristics. And it is by the light of these principles that he asks us to examine the claims of the Roman Catholic Church. If Romanism—such is the evident meaning of his language—cherishes a profound respect for the divinely-gifted intelligence and heaven-born freedom of man; if it recognizes and fosters the sacred and inalienable rights of reason, liberty, and independence as divine gifts, which man dare not surrender if he would, then this system may be

regarded as meeting the demands of the age. Wanting these, it could have no claims to either our respect or our confidence.

Thus, the issue is presented in the clearest, simplest, and least ambiguous terms possible. Romanism is to be tested by its spirit. If it is the friend and supporter of freedom and independence, of reason and judgment, it is, to the extent of such fostering care, the true religion; and if not, it is false. Whether the submission, by the author, of so hazardous a test was the result of a sublime confidence in the ability of his Church to abide its application, or of a reckless audacity which hoped to deter investigation by the mere boldness of assertion, may, perhaps, be determined in the sequel; at present it is sufficient to emphasize the fact, now conceded, and even pressed upon the attention, by Romanists themselves, that *no religion is adapted to this age, or worthy of its acceptance, which does not acknowledge and respect the heaven-born freedom of man.*

So solicitous is our author not to be misunderstood respecting this leading principle, that he ventures even to express himself as follows:

"Every man was made by his Creator to do his own thinking. What right, then, has one man, or a body of men, to dictate to others their own belief, or make their private convictions or sentiments binding upon their fellows?"

If this language, and that previously quoted, be honestly meant—and we should be reluctant to believe the contrary—and if it expresses, as it claims to do, the genuine principles of the Romish Church, then, indeed, the grossest injustice has been done to its character and spirit. It teaches that man was created *free;* that his freedom is *inalienable;* that he is endowed with reason and free-will, with judgment, liberty, and independence; and that no human authority has the right to invade these sacred possessions. It teaches that every man was made by his Creator to do his own thinking; that religion is a matter between him and God alone; and that no man—such as the Pope, for example—and no body of men—such as the Council of Trent—has any right to dictate to him, or interfere with him. As for the individual himself, he has no right to *surrender* his judgment either to these or to any other human authority. The case is closed. The matter is settled. Romanists are free, absolutely and perfectly free, henceforth and forever. It follows, of course, that Romanism is adapted to the age, and worthy of all acceptation.

We should be most happy to believe it. Nothing—we write it in all sincerity—would rejoice us more than to be made thoroughly satisfied that this religion, whatever its corruptions in doctrine and worship, is the honest and ardent friend of true freedom. We should not, however, be expected to recognize the "wooden horse" as the palladium of our safety, and to introduce it with songs and rejoicings—eloquently as we have been urged to do so—until after we shall have examined its contents more closely. *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

The affair seems to us—if we may be permitted to change the figure—like a stage trick. Possibly, after all, it was only to amuse us that Mr. Hecker introduced his beloved mistress to the American public in so unexpected a costume. And if such was his design, he has succeeded to admiration. He brings her forward, to the astonishment of the audience, in the *role* of the Goddess of Liberty, and dressed, of course, in character. Her face, so long known, and so well, is covered with a mask which looks somewhat like reason; the "red, white, and blue" are garishly conspicuous in all her garments; he has placed upon her head a jaunty little cap, eminently suggestive of *sans culottes* and "*vive la liberte*"! while in one hand she is made to hold the "Star-spangled banner," and with the other to stroke and fondle our "glorious bird" in the sweetest and most fascinating manner ever seen! *Spectatum admissi, risum teneatis amici?*

Sooth to say, it is a beautiful conception, and most admirably executed. As a *tableau vivant* we question if it has ever been excelled upon the American boards! And, now, if this lovely creature could only be persuaded to hold her tongue, and permit Father Hecker to do all the talking, the applause would doubtless be all that even he could desire. But, alas! she has been accustomed to be *heard.* Like the crow in the fable, she prides herself especially upon her *voice.* She grows visibly restive while the "manager," in eloquent phrase, dilates upon the *inalienable* rights of reason and liberty. Like an experienced actress, however, she bears it heroically for a time; but when, at length, the well-meaning but indiscreet master of ceremonies announces that "*Every man* was made by his Creator to do *his own thinking*," she can endure it no longer. Tearing off her mask, throwing away her cap of liberty, trampling under foot the "Stars and Stripes," and telling the eagle to "Go," she marches forward to the front of the stage, and with a copy of the Decrees and

Canons of Trent in her hand, proclaims, in imperial tone: "Whoever shall teach or *think* in opposition to *these decrees*, LET HIM BE ACCURSED!"

If we now turn to the Reverend Paulist and ask him how he harmonizes this authoritative declaration with his most liberal sentiments, his answer is ready:

"The authority of the general *councils* of the Catholic Church is, with its members, beyond all dispute. . . . Nothing is required to be believed but upon *adequate authority*, and *thus* the demands of the highest reason are satisfied. . . If the Church be a divine authority, whose office is not to increase but define and confirm the divinely-revealed truths, its *exercise can but* be consonant with reason, the inward light of the Holy Ghost, and Sacred Scripture. The idea of any *clashing* between them is *absurd*, and can never enter an *intelligent and well-regulated* mind!"

We begin, at length, to understand the matter. The beautiful sentiments about reason, liberty, judgment, and independence, which so bewildered us a while ago, were expressed, we now perceive, *cum grano salis*. Every man was made by his Creator to do his own thinking—provided he always think as the Church does! No man has the right to surrender his judgment—except to the Catholic Church! Independence is an inalienable gift—but it must not be exercised outside of the authority of the Church! Into the sacred sphere of these heaven-bestowed blessings, no human authority may penetrate—but, mark you, the *Church* is a *divine* authority! No body of men may lawfully dictate to others their own private convictions; but then the convictions of the Holy Synod were *not* private; they, consequently, are authoritative, and "beyond all dispute"! The mind that could entertain a *thought* in opposition to the decrees of so holy and so general a council, deserves only to *be cursed*. Such a mind is not "intelligent" nor "well regulated." It is beyond the pale of true reason, and can be reached only by the potential argument of *anathema sit!*

In the light of such a commentary upon their own text, it becomes simply ludicrous to witness the efforts of Romanists in this country to hold up their Church as the great patroness of liberty. If this is what *they* mean by Reason, Judgment, and Independence, we have to tell them that this is precisely what *we* mean by Romish bigotry, intolerance, and persecution. And they should be told, in all kindness, that if their drugs are *not* adapted to the wants of the age,

and *not* worthy of being received, they will not enhance their own reputation by knavishly affixing false labels to them. For a Church which has ever been inflexibly despotic and intolerant, and which, from its very genius, must necessarily be so, to assume to lecture Americans, and especially American Protestants, on the principles of civil and religious liberty, would be supremely audacious, if it were not superlatively ludicrous. *On n'est jamais si ridicule par les qualites que l'on a, que par celles que l'on affecte d'avior.* We commend this maxim to the author of the "Aspirations." Let him, if he will, advocate the authority of his Church—it is his privilege to do so; let him also insist, if he so please, upon its universality and its infallibility. It is not in our heart to disturb a fancy which ministers so copiously to self-gratulation and complacency. But we beg him to admit that these unsupported assumptions, as hitherto maintained by his Church, are inconsistent with any free exercise of Reason, any just idea of Independence, any manly use of Judgment. When he shall have made this admission, we may be able to honor his candor as much as we now commiserate his infatuation. But when he assumes, as he now does, the office of censor; when he has the temerity to charge Protestantism with opposition to Reason and Liberty, it is Napoleon complaining of ambition! It is Nero delivering a lecture on mercy! *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?*

It may possibly be thought that our conclusion as to the Spirit of Romanism has been deduced from insufficient premises; that American Romanists, at least, will not admit its correctness; and that, notwithstanding the later declarations of Mr. Hecker's book may seem to breathe the old *animus*, its earlier chapters are clearly in harmony with the more Christian spirit of liberal and enlightened Protestantism. It may hence be inferred that the Church, either in its members or in its head, or, perhaps, in both, has harmonized, or, at any rate, is seeking to harmonize, itself with progress, with liberalism, and with modern civilization. If this be so, none will be more ready, as none will be more rejoiced, than we to acknowledge and record it. To determine this point we must ascertain, from an induction of authentic facts, 1. What Romanism *was;* and, 2. What Romanism *is.*

The reader who is familiar, as every one should be, with the excellent Church histories designated at the head of this article, or

with others of similar character, may be presumed to have a just and accurate conception of what Romanism was. By the aid of these authorities he has doubtless traced the causes, arising both in the Church and in the State, which concurred in its production and development. On this point we would particularly recommend the *History of Romanism*, by Dr. Dowling. Though not altogether free from a certain tone of partisanship, which we think detracts from it as a work of history, it is, nevertheless, exceedingly valuable to the general reader, especially for the many decrees and canons of different councils which it quotes, and for other facts and documents not elsewhere so readily accessible.

These impartial historians are singularly careful that their readers shall never lose sight of the elements of truth retained by the Church during all the successive periods of its spiritual declension; nor yet of the many works of mercy and benevolence which, in ages of darkness and inhumanity, she was the instrument of accomplishing. They do not, however, as, indeed, they could not, conceal the fact that these truths became gradually more and more obscured by a superincumbent and ever-increasing mass of superstition and falsehood. Nor is it any fault of these writers if the good works which they so kindly and so fully portray, are rendered unduly prominent by the dark ground of intolerance, oppression, and blood upon which they were obliged by the truth to paint them.

We are not surprised to find that what came finally to be known and designated by all intelligent Scripturists as the Great Apostasy, was the result of a *succession* of apostasies; or, as we might express it, the terminus of ages of downward progress. This was natural, and might have been expected. *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus.* But we could not have anticipated the fact that the pretensions of the Church at each successive stage of its declension would be, without exception, inversely as her doctrinal and spiritual merits. It required her history to disclose, as it does, a phenomenon so astounding. She had, for example, gone far into corruption and worldly lusts before she assumed, as her organic designation, the title "Holy." It was not until Neo-Platonism and other false philosophies and speculations had so corrupted her faith as to drive out of her communion, and back to the Gospel, the purest and best of her members, that she became, *par excellence*, the "Catholic" Church. And so it was,

after Pagan rites and idolatrous ritualism had supplanted the few and simple ceremonies of the Apostles, that she proclaimed herself "Apostolic." She pretended, too, to fill the *office* and to wield the *authority* of the Apostles—but not until lust, ambition, and strife had driven forever from her bosom the Holy Spirit which had animated and guided them. Thus, step by step, she continued to go down from the lofty position of truth and purity occupied by the Primitive Church, increasing her pretensions as she lost her graces, until at last the amazing spectacle was exhibited before God and men of a worshiper of idols and an adorer of saints claiming to be the Vicar of Christ and the Father of His Church Universal!

Spiritual degradation could descend no lower—spiritual presumption and arrogance could ascend no higher. It needed now but the master mind of Hildebrand to assert and to maintain that as "the Holy See has *absolute power* over all spiritual things, why should it not also rule temporal affairs? God reigns in the heavens—*his Vicar should reign over all the earth*"—and Romanism was complete!

We have now reached a point in this rapid survey at which we may profitably pause for a moment, to inquire what must necessarily be the attitude to the world and to the Church of a Hierarchy pretending to such authority as this. Can it foster individual liberty? Can it encourage the exercise of reason? Can it tolerate freedom of conscience? Can it permit a word, or even a thought, in opposition to itself? No sensible man believes that it can. No one of even ordinary intelligence can fairly and candidly consider the meaning of these claims without perceiving that they are essentially and absolutely opposed to human freedom; that they can not be harmonized with liberty, because, by their very terms, they antagonize it. They assert *absolute power* over all spiritual matters; and this, be the claim right or wrong, is neither less nor more than despotism.

These lofty pretensions may indeed have been abandoned—we do not in this place inquire into that matter—but we do wish to say, here and now, that unless the present Pope of Rome clearly and unambiguously *disclaims* and *renounces* them—not simply as being impolitic, but because they are unlawful and unrighteous—then whoever seeks to commend Romanism to Americans as the patron of freedom, offers an insult to their intelligence and an imposition to their credulity.

Our readers should not fail to observe, also, the logical consequence deduced by Hildebrand from the assumed nature of his office. He asserted that the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, had the right to reign over all the earth, and that his power was equally absolute over temporal as over spiritual matters. In this he was consistent. For, if the Pope really occupies the place of God upon earth; if he actually and truly fills the office of Jesus Christ by Divine right and appointment, as every Romanist believes, then he is not only head of the Church, but "head over all things for the Church;" not only Shepherd and Bishop of souls, but "King of kings and Lord of lords." He has the right, absolutely and indefeasibly, by grant Divine, to change times and laws, to destroy constitutions, to make and unmake kings and emperors—in one word, to "*reign over all the earth.*" Popes have asserted this right, in these very words, as *infallible* truth; they have repeatedly acted upon it as an established and recognized principle; and we know that it is involved logically and necessarily in one of the cardinal items of Romish faith. Whoever, therefore, believes that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ, must either stultify himself or believe, at the same time, that he has the supremacy, both temporal and spiritual, over the whole world.

Still we will not pertinaciously insist upon the logical consequences of this doctrine if they shall be disclaimed—not by Romanists, but by Rome; not by Churchmen, but by the Church; not by Papists, but by the Pope. Let the authority which sets them aside be equal at least to that which established them. We care not that Gregory VII excommunicated Henry IV, and absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance. We are quite willing to believe that in this he exceeded the limits of his authority—provided the reigning Pope will but tell us so! That Innocent III excommunicated Otho, deposed King John, and bestowed the kingdom of England upon France, as Adrian had given Ireland to England, is nothing but pleasant reading—if only we can be assured by Pius IX that his predecessors, in performing these acts, transcended the limits of their rightful authority. But if it shall be found that he indorse and approve them all, then the case becomes totally different; then, indeed, these acts of his predecessors are as full of significance and warning as if they had been done by himself.

We open now the last Syllabus of the reigning Pontiff, and read as an *error condemned*, the following:

"The Roman Pontiffs and the Œcumenical Councils have *exceeded the limits of their power, usurped the rights of princes*, and erred even in the definition of matters of faith and morals." (Syllabus, xxiii.)

Nothing could be plainer. This language is clearly equivalent to a distinct and positive re-assertion of the rightfulness and legitimacy of the most arrogant claims and imperial acts of Gregory VII, of Innocent III, and of Sixtus V. These Pontiffs never exceeded the limits of their power; they never usurped the rights of princes! Pius IX will not certainly depose Victoria, as his predecessor deposed John; he will not sell the United States to Spain, as Clement sold Sicily to Charles of Anjou—but he asserts, none the less positively, his *right* to do it if he could. The *spirit* is willing; it is the flesh only that is weak.

Our readers may feel curious to know how such a *dictum* of the Sovereign Pontiff is received by his subjects in America. Do they approve, or condemn it? Inharmonious as it manifestly is with our institutions and with all our ideas of human rights and privileges, the question is grave and important. Do they receive it coldly? Do they accept it with abatement? Do they regret to see such a spirit exhibited? such despotism justified? such lawless usurpation legalized? Would that we could say so! But, so far from it, the Archbishop of Cincinnati, who stands high on the roll of Roman fame, and who may safely be regarded as a representative man among American Catholics, expresses himself thus, concerning the very Syllabus from which we have quoted:

"We receive it *implicitly*, we bow to it *reverently*, we embrace it *cordially*, we hail it *gratefully*. TO US IT IS AS THE VOICE OF GOD ON SINAI, ON THE JORDAN, ON THEBOR!"

After such an indorsement it will be proper for us to examine the matter yet more narrowly. We notice that not only the Roman Pontiffs, but also the Œcumenical Councils, have never, in a single instance, exceeded the limits of their power. This being so, we direct attention to a decree of one of these Councils, presided over by a Roman Pontiff, and therefore clearly embraced by the approbatory

dictum of the Syllabus. This decree will manifest as plainly as any fact we could produce the spirit of Romanism *as it was;* while the Syllabus will give to it all the sanction of Romanism *as it is.* We refer, as may have been anticipated, to the Fourth Council of Lateran, and its decree for the *extirpation of heretics.* It says:

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy extolling itself against this holy, orthodox, Catholic faith, which we before expounded, *condemning all heretics*, by what names soever called. And being condemned, let them be left to the secular power, or to their bailiffs, *to be punished* by due animadversion."

This sounds very little like American freedom of conscience, even as it stands; but if the matter paused here it would be comparatively innocent. It might be said that the Church condemns the heresy and the heretic, but she does not invade the heretic's liberty. She simply *leaves* him to the secular power. If that *punishes* him, it is no concern of hers. *She* does not do it. In the same way she washes her hands of all the Inquisitorial blood that was shed. It was no act of hers; it was the "secular power" that did it all. It hence becomes important to quote further upon this point. The Council proceeds to decree:

"And let the secular powers be *warned and induced*, and, if need be, condemned by ecclesiastical censure, what offices soever they are in, that as they desire to be reputed and taken for believers, so they *publicly take an oath* for the defense of the faith, that they will study in good earnest *to exterminate*, to their *utmost power*, from the lands subject to their jurisdiction, ALL HERETICS *denoted by the Church;* so that every one that is henceforth taken into *any power*, *either spiritual or temporal*, shall be bound to *confirm this chapter by his oath.*"

This would seem to be strong enough in all conscience, but even this does not satisfy the spirit of Romanism. It leaves a chance, a bare chance, we admit, but still a chance, that some poor heretic may escape with his life. It is just possible that some secular ruler, notwithstanding his oath, may stop short in the butchery of his subjects, innocent and conscientious as he knows them to be, before the work of extermination is entirely complete. He may have some bowels of mercy left. The spirit of the old Gospel which "blesses and curses not;" of Him who wept over obstinate sinners, but left them *free;* who came "not to destroy men's lives but to save them;" such a spirit may breathe its hallowing influence over his heart, and restrain his hand. Evidently, there is danger here. Human nature itself is

so much better than Romanism, that it must be stimulated to perform its unholy work. Hence the decree proceeds:

"But if the temporal lord, *required and warned by the Church*, shall neglect to purge his territory of this *heretical filth*, let him, by the metropolitan and comprovincial bishops, be *tied by the bond of excommunication;* and if he scorn to satisfy within a year, let that be signified to the *Pope*, that he may proclaim his vassals thenceforth *absolved from their allegiance to him*, and may expose his country to *be seized on by Catholics*, who, the heretics being excommunicated, *may possess it without any contradiction.*"

Mr. Hecker may be able to perceive in all this the fostering hand of a loving mother, tenderly cherishing and conserving the sacred and inalienable rights and liberties of man. His perspicacity is equal to it. Pius IX also thinks well of it. The Pontiff and the Council, so he avers, had the *right* to do as they did. They were clearly within the limits of legitimate power. If any man say otherwise his proposition is condemned as *error*. "Thank you, thank you!" says our Archbishop; "we hail this gratefully, we receive it implicitly, we embrace it cordially, we bow to it reverently. It is as the voice of God upon Sinai!"

Evidence, such as that we have already quoted, might be produced by the volume. The council of Constance, the sixteenth general council, solemnly sanctioned the decree of the fourth Lateran, and carried it into execution by the murder of Huss and Jerome. The council of Sienna, which was continued at Basil, commanded the inquisitors in every place to extirpate every heresy, especially those of Wickliff, Huss, and Jerome. Princes were admonished by the mercy of God to exterminate error, if they would escape the Divine vengeance.

But why should we multiply examples? A single one is proof conclusive that the *principle* of persecution for conscience' sake is recognized, adopted, and enjoined by the highest authority known to the Catholic Church. It is believed to be infallibly right, and therefore always right. Consequently, it is consistent with the system to make the decrees for the extirpation of heresy and the extermination of heretics part of the faith of the Church; an article, the belief of which is necessary to salvation. Hence, in the creed of Pope Pius IV, which is binding upon every Romanist in the world, and which every bishop and priest "promises, vows, and swears most

constantly to hold and profess whole and entire to the end of life," this article occurs:

"I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and *general councils*, and particularly by the holy council of Trent; and, likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church."

Such being the genuine, earnest, and solemnly professed faith of Romanists, it is not surprising that the ablest and most zealous dignitaries among them should attempt to justify it. We present a specimen of their reasoning upon the subject. It is from Cardinal Bellarmine—*clarum et venerabile nomen.*

"We will briefly show that the Church has the power and ought to cast off incorrigible heretics, especially those who have relapsed; and that the secular power ought to inflict on such temporal punishments, and even death itself.

"1. This may be proved from the Scriptures. 2. It is proved from the opinions and laws of the emperors, which the Church has always approved. 3. It is proved by the laws of the Church. 4. It is proved by the testimony of the fathers. Lastly. It is proved from natural reason; for,

"First, It is owned by all, that heretics may, of right, be excommunicated—of course they may be put to death. This consequence is proved because excommunication is a greater punishment than temporal death.

"Secondly, Experience proves that there is no other remedy; for the Church has, step by step, tried all remedies; first, excommunication alone, then pecuniary penalties, afterward banishment, and lastly, has been forced to put them to death—to send them to their own place.

"Thirdly, All allow that forgery deserves death; but heretics are guilty of forgery of the Word of God.

"Fourthly, A breach of faith by man toward God is a greater sin than of a wife with her husband. But a woman's unfaithfulness is punished with death; why not a heretic's?

"Fifthly, There are three grounds on which reason shows that heretics should be put to death; the first is: lest the wicked should injure the righteous; second, that by the punishment of a few, many may be reformed. For many who were made torpid by impunity, are roused by the fear of punishment; and this, we daily see, is the result where the inquisition flourishes.

"Finally, It is a benefit to obstinate heretics to remove them from this life; for the longer they live the more errors they invent, the more persons they mislead, and the greater damnation do they treasure up to themselves."

The learned Cardinal proceeds to answer the objections of Luther and other heretics; for, strange to say, they were not convinced by his reasoning, notwithstanding they were so clearly to be

"benefited" by its practical application. One or two of these answers may be given as specimens of the whole:

"'The Church,' says Luther, 'from the beginning even to this time, has never burned a heretic. Therefore, it does not seem to be the mind of the Holy Spirit that they should be burned.'

"I reply, that this argument proves not the sentiment, but the ignorance or impudence of Luther; for, as *almost an infinite number were either burned or otherwise put to death*, Luther either did not know it, and was therefore ignorant, or, if he knew it, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood; for that *heretics were often burned* BY THE CHURCH, *may be proved by adducing a few from many examples.*"

It is not necessary to say that Luther had a different Church in his mind from that which filled the heart of the Cardinal; for this does not affect the significance of the *fact* stated and urged in reply. Once more:

"Argument Second. 'Experience shows that terror is not useful.' I reply, experience proves the contrary; for *the Donatists, Manicheans, and Albigenses were routed and annihilated by arms.*"

Facts and documents such as we have presented show conclusively what Romanism *was*. We have now to say that it has not changed. In the very nature of the case it can not change. If "full of cursing and bitterness" in the past, it is full of cursing and bitterness now. Its advocates and supporters in America may be ashamed or afraid to exhibit its true spirit; we are glad to see that some of them are; it may even be possible that there are those among them, better than their system, who would be willing for it to *be* what they are so anxious to have it *seem* to be. But they are powerless. The best that can be done for it, by even its most zealous friends, is to cover and keep out of sight its more repulsive and ghastly features. Even this promises but moderate and short-lived success. The face of Mokhanna is now so well known that it is recognized even *through* the silver veil, and when this drops, as, in the hands of unskillful manipulators, it often does, the very spirit within is portrayed upon the horrid countenance without.

Our good friend, the Archbishop, is singularly clumsy and awkward in the management of this useful article of ecclesiastical millinery. He is so possessed by the spirit of "the Dark Ages of light," and so anxious to restore them, that he sometimes gets confused in his chronology, and fancies that the world is still where he is, radiant amid the glories of the thirteenth century! In his hallucination

he scorns disguise. Regardless, alike, of Father Hecker and his "Goddess of Liberty," and forgetting that his Church is, as yet, only struggling for power, not clothed with it, he actually justifies intolerance, condemns liberty of thought, quotes Christ and the Apostles on his side, and so dazzled is he by the splendors of his anachronistic position, that he can positively see no difference between tolerance and approbation. "I ask," says he, "if the Church which *holds the place of God on earth*, does wrong when, leaving man to think freely, she forbids him to think badly?" Perhaps not. But what if the man knows she will *burn* him for thinking badly? Is that leaving him to think freely? When reminded that Giordano Bruno was burned in the city of Rome for thinking and speaking "freely," the reply of the Archbishop is: that "continuing to dogmatize and abuse the Pope as the 'beast,' *he met the fate he merited.*" When the bloody deeds of an inquisitor, whom he assisted to canonize, are presented before him, his response, which he evidently considers conclusive and crushing, is: "*The instinct of self-preservation originated the Inquisition.*" The council of Constance and the Emperor Sigismund *did right*, so he assures us, in the matter of the Bohemian Reformers. After they had enjoyed "*full liberty* to defend their opinions, and these opinions were *refuted* and *condemned*, but unretracted, their *obstinacy changed their position*, and made them amenable as the open and avowed enemies of religion and society, to the penal legislation then in force." This is Roman Catholic liberty, as advocated in Cincinnati. Theirs was a "deserved fate," says the Archbishop. If he is right, every Protestant in America whose "unretracted opinions" the Archbishop fancies he has "refuted," deserves the same fate; and all would meet it, doubtless, were his power but equal to his wishes.

Let us further examine the ground of this "deserved fate," as set forth in the language of the Archbishop himself. "Huss, deeply tainted with the doctrines of Wickliff, taught that the Church consisted exclusively of the just and predestinate; reprobates and sinners, according to him, making no part of this society." No wonder he was "refuted"! At the bar of a council composed so largely of "reprobates and sinners," who yet claimed to be the "Church," the proof was abundant and overwhelming. But there is more of this heresy: "Hence he concluded that a bad Pope, for instance, was no longer the Vicar of Jesus Christ; that bishops and priests, living in

a state of sin, forfeited, of course, all claim to jurisdiction and ministerial power." Dreadful heresy! Rome could not endure such "pernicious tenets." The Church "forbids men to think badly," and this was thinking very "badly," indeed. Who does not see that the *Holy* Catholic Church will not survive a moment if you take away its "reprobates and sinners"? If a "bad Pope" can not be Vicar of Jesus Christ, what is to become of that necessary office? And, if "bishops and priests, *living* in a *state* of sin," are not to be heard and honored as the Apostles of Jesus Christ, pray who are? "Huss was condemned to the stake, and executed for his *seditious opinions*, in 1415." Served him right, says our Archbishop.

Savonarola, too, "one of the most splendid intellects of the fifteenth century," was guilty of "thinking badly." This "proud reformer had rejected," says the Archbishop, "the advances of mercy, laughed at the thunders of the Church," (*Horresco referens!*) "persisted in his sacrilegious preaching, and *now stood in open revolt against the supreme head of the Christian world.*" Mercy on us! We need not be told what became of him. "Savonarola suffered death. . . . A *victim of his own ungovernable pride.*" The *Church* was not in fault, let us bear that in mind; the Archbishop of Florence, before whom he was tried, was not in fault; he was the victim, not of *persecution* nor *intolerance*, but of his own *ungovernable pride.*

But enough of this. We had expected to quote some expressions of Romish spirit from the *Catholic Telegraph*, but we forbear. Its evidence, fortunately, is not needed to make out our case; and we gladly avoid defiling our pages with its pollution. It will be more to our taste to present a quotation commended to us by the distinguished prelate who has already so happily and so freely contributed to our cause in this paper.

"As for eighteen centuries there have been no forms of civil society, no calms or tempests in the moral, political, social, or religious world, in which the Catholic Church has not been *true to the organic principles of her divine life*, even the enemy of Catholicity should admit—that fact being granted—that the presumption is on her side that *she will be equally true to those principles during the centuries that are to come.*"

If this rhetoric, when translated into plain statement, means that Romanism is unchanged and unchangeable, it expresses the very truth with which we had expected to close this article. We believe that

the organic principles of the system; those which distinguish it, which give it form and vitality, and which direct and control its operations, are precisely now what they were during the ages of its power. No claim has been abated, no blasphemous pretension lowered, no persecuting decree repealed, no rights of humanity conceded. All, without one single exception, are in *statu quo*. Through the infinite mercy of God to the world, the *power* of this despotism is waning; but its consumptive body is still animated by the spirit which, in all ages, has made it the arch-enemy of human rights and human liberties.

Society has changed. Protestant presses and Protestant Bible Societies—"pests," which Pio Nono "has often reprobated in the most severe terms," to quote his own language—have accomplished a great work in the interest of truth and freedom. The people have learned that *they* have rights as well as their rulers; that God's Word was intended for all, as it is addressed to all; and that a hierarchy which imperiously dictates and imposes its own faith, while it is *afraid to disseminate God's truth*, is condemned and reprobated by its own act. Those who cherish some lingering respect for Popery; who fancy that by some process, hitherto untried, it might, as they feel sure it should, adapt itself to an age of light and knowledge, of thought and reason, of progress and liberty, have ventured respectfully to say so. But their hopes have been crushed by an official condemnation. Deeply feeling that Romanism was at war with the spirit of the age, they have said that

> "The Roman Pontiff *can* and *ought* to reconcile and harmonize himself with progress, with liberalism, and with modern civilization."

But this proposition, moderate and reasonable as it is, the present Pope of Rome condemns as *error!* By this he plainly says that he neither *can* nor *ought* to reconcile himself to the progress and liberty which characterize the age. He condemns, in like manner, the proposition that, "In this our age it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held to be *the only religion of the State*, to the *exclusion of all other forms of worship!*" So also he condemns the provision of law by which, "in certain *Catholic* countries, men emigrating there should be *permitted* the public exercise of their own several forms of worship!" Thus, it is perceived, that the

very law which is the crowning glory of American freedom—a law which protects Catholics and Protestants alike in the free exercise of their religion, and under the protection of which Catholics are now boasting that in a few years they will become predominant in our land—this very law, the moment America shall become a "Catholic country," will be found condemned in advance. And this by the *absolute* Sovereign of all the earth! Add but one more *dictum*, and the enmity of Catholicism to our institutions can not be doubted. If Church and State may continue rightfully to remain separate, the case would not be utterly hopeless. But, alas! his "Holiness" has solemnly declared that "the Church ought *not* to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church!"

This, then, is what Romanism proposes to do for us:

1. To establish the Catholic as the only Religion of the State.

2. To *exclude* all other forms of worship, not *permitting* them to be exercised; and,

3. To accomplish all this by representing the Church as the true, and, indeed, the only friend, of civil and religious liberty.

We have only to add, that whoever believes this false representation must shut his eyes to the doctrines, to the claims, and to the History of the Church; all of which demonstrate that the real and unchangeable Spirit of Romanism is now, as it has ever been, at war with the dearest and most sacred rights of man; that it is the enemy of freedom, of judgment, and of independence; and that, as such, it is unworthy the respect or the confidence of a liberal and enlightened age.

V.—THE CONNECTION BETWEEN BAPTISM AND THE REMISSION OF SINS.

IN no age of the Church has she failed to assert the obligation of Baptism. So positive are the precepts of the Scriptures on this subject, so demonstrative the practice of the Apostles, and so unanimous the unbroken testimony of the great cloud of Patristic teachers, that no phase of evangelical ecclesiasticism has dared to so modify or change the uniform rule, as to admit to the privileges of the Church any unbaptized applicant for recognition. Whatever else they may have differed about, on this point they have been a unit. They have said, with one voice: Between the world and the Church there stands the "bath of regeneration." Whether it be the Jordan, the "much water" of Enon, the wayside pool on the "way to Gaza," the sculptured font of less ancient precedent, or the still later abridgment of the paltry pitcher—whether immersion, affusion, or rhantism—in all time, through all changes, and by all evangelical branches, baptism, in name if not in fact, has been held up as the one indispensable "sacrament," without which the hand of fellowship could not be extended, nor the rights of citizenship allowed. Differ as they might about the "doctrine" of baptism, they were unanimous in holding it to be a Divine requisition, and debate as they would about what is sophistically called the "mode," they had no controversy as to the duty of all to submit to it in some form.

If such be the place which this institution has held through all the centuries of Christianity, must not there be some reason for it, fixed and profound as the very foundations of our redemption? And what can such reason be, short of an established and recognized connection, of some sort, between baptism and the remission of sins? If baptism were an insignificant, a meaningless rite, a mere Oriental custom of Apostolic times, a thing of fashion, or an accident of climate, it would, doubtless, like the "salutation" of the "kiss," or the courtesy of "feet-washing," have long since dropped out of the fixed ordinances of the Church, and become a thing of indifference. On the contrary, not only has it been uncompromisingly maintained, but

upon *grounds* which exalt it into a *significance* and *purpose* that justify the high importance which has ever been attached to it.

We propose to consider these grounds:

I. Historically; as they have been held by the great representative thinkers and teachers of Christianity, ancient and modern.

II. As they are taught and explained in the Scriptures.

1. Before introducing the testimony of the "ancient Fathers" on this subject, it seems proper that we should say a few words as to the authority which should be given to their reports of facts, and to their interpretations of Scripture. In no case can we regard their statements as inspired. As men, they were not only fallible, but, some of them, visionary and dishonest. They differed among themselves, and not unfrequently the same Father was inconsistent with himself. In polemics, they were often the merest partisans; in speculation, sometimes the wildest theorists; in dogmatics, frequently dictatorial and denunciatory; and, as interpreters of Apostolic teaching, largely affected by the spirit of the times, and the corrupting influences of ignorance and fashion. Still, if we use them aright, they are not unworthy of our careful attention. One of the first distinctions to be made in studying their writings is that between their statement of *facts*, and their expression of their *opinions*. As to *facts*, their authority is, certainly, entitled to distinguished consideration; for they stood near to the things whereof they testify, and spoke under the critical and vigilant censorship of hosts of hostile commentators. True, they sometimes pervert the facts in order to fit them to their arguments; but, if we watch them as they are passed through the crucible of controversy, we can generally determine what is genuine and true. As to their interpretations of Scripture, these were, on many subjects, diverse and discordant. In such cases, they, of course, have no authority whatever. But where there is general or unbroken harmony, where there is no diversity, but the judgment is one and undisputed, linking itself directly to Apostolic times, and passing down with unchallenged acceptance through all phases of controversy, and with every variety of theorist, then it rises to the dignity of a law, and, though subject to revision under comparison with the supreme

and infallible standard, claims a rank in our criteria of truth next to that of inspiration.

In introducing the Fathers, then, as throwing light upon our subject, we shall estimate their testimony by this rule: where there is unanimous, or almost unanimous, agreement among the great representative men of the Primitive Church as to a fact or the interpretation of a passage of Scripture, and this agreement can be traced back to an origin, if not in, at least the nearest to, the Apostolic times, and without contradiction of history, or inconsistency with Scripture, then we must accept it as of highest authority, next to inspiration itself, in our judgment and faith.

Among the Fathers called Apostolic, *two* testify on our subject in language that admits of no ambiguity; first of these is Barnabas. He was the companion and friend of Paul. Luke says of him, "He was a good man, and full of the Holy Spirit, and of faith." (Acts xi, 24.) Tradition says he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel with the great Apostle to the Gentiles. He was a distinguished "teacher of much people," even among the Apostles themselves, and stood for zeal, knowledge, and inspiration, next to these authorized teachers of the Kingdom. His Epistle was written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, while the beloved St. John was yet alive, and addressed to disciples who had been taught by the Apostles themselves, and who, therefore, could well judge of its harmony with their instructions. Speaking of baptism, he says: "It is written how that the children of Israel would not receive that baptism which brings to forgiveness of sins, but would institute another to themselves, that can not." Again: "We go down into the water full of sins and pollution, but come up again bringing forth fruit; having in our hearts the fear and hope which is in Jesus by the Spirit." (Ch. x, vs. 2, 14.) Here is the language of a man more conspicuous in New Testament history than many of the Apostles, accustomed to travel and preach with Paul, the chosen evangelist of the Church at Corinth, to officiate with him in visiting the Provincial Churches, and ordaining elders in them, writing to disciples, many of whom he and Paul had brought to baptism, and within a few years after Paul's departure, affirming a connection between baptism and the remission of sins, which, we shall show, is not only in harmony with the teachings of Paul as delivered

to us in the Scriptures, but also with the general voice of antiquity. What is the testimony worth?

Contemporary with Barnabas was "the Shepherd of St. Hermas." He was one of the brethren at Rome whom Paul salutes by name in his letter to that Church. (xvi, 14.) His work was written, in all probability, about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and was regarded by some as worthy of a place in the Canonical Scriptures. "Irenæus quotes it under the very name of 'Scripture;'" and Athanasius tells us, "that though not strictly canonical, yet it was reckoned among the books which the Fathers appointed to be read to such as were to be instructed in the faith, and desired to be directed in the way of piety." (Epist. Pasch., tom. ii, p. 39.) Origen, Eusebius, and St. Hierom have delivered like high testimony as to the estimation in which it was held. What says he on our subject?

In his "Visions" he is setting forth the building of the Church under the instruction of a venerable lady. He saw that the tower was built upon water, [baptism,] and he asked why? She replied, "The tower is built upon water because your life is and shall be saved by water" [baptism.] (Vis. iii, v. 42.) In his "Commands" he assumes to speak by the instruction of "a man of reverend look, in the habit of a shepherd." Addressing this instructor, he said, "I have even now heard, from certain teachers, that there is no other repentance besides that of baptism, when we go down into the water and receive the forgiveness of our sins, and that after that we must sin no more, but live in purity." (Com. iv, v. 18.) In his book of "Similitudes" he says: "Before a man receives the name of the Son of God he is ordained unto death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from death and assigned unto life. Now, that seal is the water of baptism, into which men go down under the obligation unto death, but come up appointed unto life." (Sim. ix, vs. 152–3.)

Such are the statements of *two* eminent men of Apostolic times, as to the connection between baptism and the remission of sins. There can be no question as to the meaning of these passages, and it is remarkable how strictly they conform in expression to Apostolic style. Both of these writers had listened to Paul, and one, at least, had been a fruitful co-laborer with him through all his Apostolic life in proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ, and making known

to the people the conditions of their admission into the kingdom of the Lord. *As* the Apostolic teaching had been delivered to them, *so* they repeat it in these letters, and confirm the disciples in the "form of sound words."

"From the earliest times," says Hagenbach, "great importance was attached to the doctrine of *baptism*, because of its supposed relation to the forgiveness of sins." This is abundantly clear to every one who will take the pains to consult the writings of the early Fathers. The writers whom we have already mentioned show us what this doctrine was in the first century. The testimony of the writers of the second century, indeed, we may say down to about the middle of the third century, or, the death of Origen, is no less full and explicit. Irenæus claims to have heard Polycarp, and to remember, with great vividness, how he told of his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord; "how he reported their sayings, and what he had heard from them respecting the Lord, his miracles and his doctrine." "These things," he says, "I wrote down, not on paper but in my heart, and by the grace of God I constantly bring them up again fresh before my memory." Speaking from such a stand-point, we naturally attach great respect to his words. Illustrating the relation of baptism to our union with Christ, he says: "As the dry wheat can not become one mass of dough and one loaf of bread without moisture, so neither can we all become one in Christ without the water which is from heaven. And as the parched earth can not yield fruit unless it receive moisture, so neither can we, who, at first, are but sapless wood, ever produce living fruit without the rain which is freely poured out from above; for *our bodies through baptism, but our souls through the Spirit, have obtained that communion with the imperishable essence.*" (Lib. iii, c. 17.)

Tertullian was born in the latter part of the second century, and was one of the most prolific writers of his time. His works embrace a wide range of topics relating to Christian doctrine, and, among them, there is one specially on baptism, (*de baptismo.*) There are some passages in this treatise which seem to ascribe to water almost a supernatural sanctifying power. This is, however, simply the result of a too curious search after analogies found in the "cosmical and psychical significance of water;" but he rejected explicitly "the notion of a purely supernatural and mechanical forgiveness of sins in

baptism," and in his "De Anima" finely remarks, concerning the effects of baptism: "When the soul attains to faith, and is transformed by the regeneration of water and the power from above, the covering of the old corruption having been removed, she beholds her whole light. She is received into the communion of the Holy Spirit, and the soul, which unites itself with the Holy Spirit, is followed by the body, which is no longer the servant of the soul, but becomes the servant of the Spirit." (De Anima, c. 41.)

Clement of Alexandria wrote about the beginning of the third century. He was a man eminently spiritual in his views, and can not be supposed to have unduly exaggerated the importance of baptism; yet, so strong was his conviction of the divinely-appointed relation between baptism and the remission of sins, that we find him agreeing with Hermas, in thinking that the "Apostles performed in hades the rite of baptism on the pious souls of the Old Testament who had not been baptized." (Strom. lib. ii, f. 379.) This may seem a mere speculation, but it is one which had been taught by the Apostolic Hermas, and seemed to them both, no doubt, a legitimate inference from the Apostolic doctrine of baptism. Hermas, speaking of the righteous souls whom he saw come out of the deep and placed in the building of the tower, asks why it was necessary; and the reply is: "It was necessary for them to ascend by water, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God but by laying aside the mortality of their former life. They, therefore, being dead, were, nevertheless, sealed with the seal [baptism] of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God." (Vis. iii, v. 150, 151.) We introduce this passage, not for any worth it may have as to the subject to which it directly relates—for this is an "untaught question" in the Scriptures—but merely to show how clearly and indisputably the doctrine of baptism, from which the inference was drawn, must have been held, since it was thus made the basis of an opinion *so extreme* as to its universal necessity as a condition of salvation.

Cyprian was a disciple of Tertullian, and we find his statements concerning the connection between baptism and the remission of sins in harmony with all we have already introduced. He says: "The forgiveness of sins having been once obtained at baptism, we earn, by constant exercise in well-doing, which is, as it were, a constant repetition of baptism, the Divine forgiveness anew." He denies, indeed,

that water purifies, *as such;* "For," says he, "water alone can not purge away sins and sanctify a man unless he have also the Holy Spirit." But in this very limitation of its power there is an implied assertion of its true place in connection with remission. Again, comparing the effects of the baptism of water with the effects of the baptism of blood, he says: "In the baptism of water, the remission of sins is received, in that of blood, the crown of virtue."

The controversy concerning infant baptism, which arose about this time, throws additional light on our subject; but, as this was more fully developed at a later period, we reserve it for examination hereafter. So, too, with the discussions concerning the re-baptization of persons who had received the ordinance from the hands of heretics. We shall postpone the examination of these to their proper order, and proceed to the consideration of the appellations of baptism current in the Primitive Church. These were numerous, and some of them highly fanciful; yet, being significant of the effects and design of baptism, they convey to us very definite ideas of the conceptions, on these subjects, prevalent at that time. "Some of these," says Bingham, "were taken from the internal and spiritual effects of it; others, from the nature and substance of the action; others, from the conditions required in the receivers; others, from the external circumstances and rites observed in the administration." (Antiq. b. xi, sec. 2.) We shall consider only such as bear upon our subject.

1. It was called *indulgentia*, indulgence, or absolution. Thus, in the African council, under Cyprian, it is termed the divine indulgence. And in the Roman council, mentioned by Cotelerius, it was said that at the Easter festival, remission of sins (meaning baptism) may be administered by either presbyter or deacon, in the presence of the Bishop in the parish churches." (Bing. Antiq. b. xi, sec. 2.) Here we see that baptism was considered, to the worthy recipient of it, as the sacrament of absolution, and so named, because it was accompanied by the remission of sins.

2. Baptism was called *regeneration* (παλιγγενεσια), and the *unction* (χρίσμα). Tertullian says: "We fishes are born in water, conformable to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, *ichthus*, (ἰχθὺς.)* Here is

* This is a reference to a well-known *acrostic*, formed of the initials of the several Greek titles of the Savior; Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Ὑιὸς, Σωτὴρ (Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior). The first letters of these Greek words make ἰχθὺς (*ichthus*), a fish.

a double allusion to baptism; but the one which connects it with the new birth is that which we particularly notice. In Cyril's Catechism it is called the "*regeneration of the soul.*" Justin Martyr calls it the "*water of life;*" yet not so as to give water regenerative power, for this was always referred to the influence of the Holy Spirit; hence, with respect to its cause, or origin, it was also called the "*spiritual birth;* whereby those who were born carnally to the world before, were now born spiritually to God." And because baptism was constantly associated with the divine operations of the Holy Spirit in sanctifying grace, it was also called the *unction* or *chrism.* At a later day, Gregory Nazianzen says: "We call it the gift, and grace, and baptism, and *unction,* and illumination, and garment of immortality, and lava of regeneration, and seal of character, and whatever else is precious and honorable." And St. Jerome, looking to this "noble effect of baptism," calls it (*Sacerdotium laici,*) the "*layman's priesthood,*" in contradistinction to the clerical priesthood.

3. It was called *salus,* salvation, because "it was the means not only of obtaining remission of sins, but of bringing men, by the grace and blood of Christ, to the glory of the kingdom of heaven." Gregory Nazianzen, introducing a person pleading for liberty to delay his baptism, makes him speak after this manner: "I stay only for my father, or mother, or brother, or wife, or children, or friends, or some near relations, and then I will be *saved;*" the meaning of which must needs be that then he *would* be baptized, in order to "obtain salvation."

4. At a very early date baptism was also called a sacrament, and the *seal of the Lord,* the *royal mark or character,* the *character of the Lord,* and the *sacrament of faith and repentance;* in all of which names we trace the uniform recognition of a divine connection between baptism and the remission of sins. As the Spirit was the internal, so baptism was the external seal; and these were joined together in all true believers. The external seal of baptism might, indeed, through default of faith and repentance in the subject, be received without the accompanying internal seal of the Spirit; as was illustrated in the case of Simon Magus; still, the uniform doctrine was, as Fulgentius expresses it, that "no man shall have eternal life who is not here first turned from his sins by repentance and faith, and set at liberty by the sacrament of faith and repentance; that is, by baptism." "When the ancient authors speak of penance and absolution, or remission of sins,

as a sacrament, they explain their meaning to be baptism, which is a sacrament requiring repentance as a condition, and granting absolution as an effect to all worthy receivers."

We have gathered these extracts concerning the ancient names of baptism mainly from Bingham's Antiquities; and they corroborate the one universal doctrine of baptism, which, we have seen, was clearly announced by two of the Apostolic teachers, and repeated, with unbroken harmony, down to the middle of the third century. Without faith and repentance it was idle and void; with them it was the (τελείωσις), and (τελετὴ), the *consecration* and *consummation* of regeneration, because it gave men the perfection of Christians and right to partake of the (τὸ τέλειον), the *telion;* which was the Lord's Supper.

Nothing serves to sharpen distinctions more than controversy. It requires the most precise definitions, and draws the lines of separation between truth and error with a precision that admits of no mistake. Heresy thus becomes one of the occasions of the clearest exposition of faith. The aggression of error strengthens the defenses of truth, and the cunning of its sophistry calls out into clearer affirmation the belief and practice of the Church. This has been emphatically the case with reference to the doctrine of baptism. Various heretical sects of the Gnostics, such as the Ascodrutæ, the Marcosians, and the Valentineans, either rejected baptism altogether, or so corrupted it as to destroy its identity with the divine institution of Christ. They placed all religion in *knowledge* or *spiritual experience,* and disparaged external corporeal symbols as of no account. Against this heresy, Tertullian wrote his book *De Baptisma.* He denounces Quintilla, a woman-preacher at Carthage, a little before his time, who set up to decry water baptism as useless, pleading that faith alone was sufficient to save men, as it did Abraham, who pleased God without any other sacrament than the sacrament of faith. He was fierce against the "libertines" of this new sect, and his zealous words are not unworthy of the study of some of our modern decriers of this institution, for we encounter a similar issue in the present age. This woman-preacher of Carthage has her modern representatives, and the necessity of baptism is decried upon similar grounds. In primitive times the doctrine was stamped as heretical, and this most learned of the Fathers directed his great powers against it in one of his most celebrated works.

The *Archontici*, the *Seleucians* and *Hermians*, the *Manichees* and *Paulicians* all refused or corrupted the Scriptural doctrine of baptism; and it was made a prominent fact in the grounds upon which they were condemned as heretics. Their baptisms, where they admitted them at all, were put upon other than the Scriptural grounds, and because they either explicitly, or by clear implication, denied "that baptizing by water was of efficacy to salvation," they were denounced as "adulterate, pernicious, and wholly evacuating the true baptism of Christ." Hence it was determined, in several councils held in the third century, mainly through the influence of Cyprian, "that all heretics coming over to the true Church must be re-baptized." (Mosheim i, 186.) These controversies show plainly the clearness and tenacity with which the Scriptural relation between baptism and the remission of sins was held by the primitive Fathers; but the doctrine is still more prominently set forth in the later disputes which grew out of it, especially by Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa—all of whom composed separate treatises on baptism—and by Augustine. Gregory Nazianzen gave many names which he deemed appropriate to baptism, speaking of which, Ullmann says: "The following is the principal thought on which this abundance of names is founded: all the blessings of Christianity appear concentrated in one point in baptism, and are dispensed, as it were, all together in one moment; but all these names can only in so far be applied to baptism as the person to be baptized possesses the right disposition, without which none can enter into the kingdom of heaven." Gregory further speaks of a *threefold birth* of man, namely: natural birth, that through baptism, and that through the resurrection. The second of these, that through baptism, he says, "is clear as daylight and free, delivers from lusts, and elevates to a higher spiritual life." Cyrill, of Jerusalem, addressing the candidate for baptism, says: "If thou believest, thou not only obtainest the forgiveness of sins, but thou effectest also that which is above man. Thou obtainest as much of grace as thou canst hold."

But it is in the discussions on infant baptism that we have this necessity of baptism most emphatically set forth. This notion of infant baptism, in fact, originated, in part, in this doctrine of baptism. It furnished one of the premises in the syllogism, the doctrine of original sin the other. We may say, that, if the authors of infant

baptism had not recognized the relation between baptism and the forgiveness of sins, the inference of infant baptism never could have been sustained; and we find, therefore, that in every form in which the argument is put, this notion enters as a necessary premise. We have no more striking instance, in all the wide range of theological speculation, of the power of a mere logical inference over the faith and practice of the Church, than that which is here furnished us. With the unquestioned fact that there is in the New Testament neither precept nor example for infant baptism, with the unbroken silence of the ancient Fathers concerning it, till the time of Tertullian and Origen, (in the third century,)* yet this practice—of which Neander says, "It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism," and "we can not prove that the Apostles ordained infant baptism from those places where the baptism of whole families is mentioned," and though it was opposed from the start by all the great zeal and learning of Tertullian—became very generally prevalent in the Churches, and at an early date, purely upon the *logical ground of an inference from premises, one of which was this doctrine of baptism, which teaches that it was for the remission of sins.*

And it is remarkable, too, that in the whole controversy, save where it is engaged in by heretics, no opponent of the innovation, even in the extremity and heat of controversy, ever attacked this premise. It stood unquestioned. The doctrine of original sin was criticised, the state of children with reference to guilt and condemnation, the possibility of other means of saving them, these and other modifications of the argument were resorted to, but no one dared to impugn the universally established connection between baptism and the remission of sins. Could a doctrine which stood unchallenged through such heat and trial of controversy, and which, if once refuted, would have

*The earlier allusion of Irenæus can not be admitted as certainly referring to infant baptism. The expression is *omnes qui per eum renascuntur in deum*, and the interpretation turns on the meaning of the word *renascuntur*. We agree with Hagenbach in thinking that Irenæus only intended here to "express the beautiful idea that Jesus was redeemer *in* every stage of life and *for* every stage of life; but that he does not say that he redeemed children by the water of baptism, unless the word *renascuntur* be interpreted by the most arbitrary *petitio principii* to refer to baptism." But should it be claimed that this word does refer to baptism, let it be remembered that it was written more than a hundred years after the New Testament, and at a time when some of the most absurd *doctrines* of the Fathers had already been introduced. It lacks the requisite of unbroken, unquestioned continuity from Apostolic times, and the sustaining harmony of Scripture teaching which we require in order to admit it to our respect in an inquiry like this on which we are engaged.

been fatal to one side of the contest, have had any shadow of doubt hanging about it? Surely, if Tertullian could have dared to deny this premise, he would have done it! He had only to say, "Baptism is not a condition of the remission of sins," and the syllogism would have been broken. "Admit," he might have said, "all that is claimed about original sin and the necessity of forgiveness even to children, yet it is not true that 'baptism is the only and necessary condition of salvation,' and, therefore, it can not be inferred that children should be baptized on this account." This would have been conclusive; but no! Tertullian dared not face the unquestioned truth of this premise, and, hence, he met the case upon other grounds.

So with later objectors to infant baptism. They never question the soundness of the position that baptism is for the remission of sins. When Augustine said, "He who is not baptized can not obtain salvation," no one controverted it; or, when he argued, "Every one is born in sin, and stands, therefore, in need of pardon. He obtains it by baptism; it cleanses children from *original sin*, and those who are baptized in later years not only from original sin, but also from actual transgressions;" they might form an issue about original sin, but about the assumed efficacy of baptism we find no word of dispute. When Ambrose taught, "No one ascends into the kingdom of heaven unless through the sacrament of baptism, 'for unless one shall be regenerated of water and the Holy Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God,'" none but a heretic ever doubted the position; and when he added, "therefore, he accepts no one, not even an infant, unless prevented by some necessity," we see how sharply the logical inference follows from the admitted premises, and how, without some qualification of the doctrine, when applied to infants, it was impossible to deny its conclusiveness.

Even the Pelagians did not dare to controvert this universally recognized doctrine. Legitimately, their theory led them to regard baptism as only of symbolical significance, and, therefore, a mere rite; but they preferred the evident inconsistency of dogmatically affirming the prevailing opinion of the Church "with regard," as Neander expresses it, "to the relations of the divine matter to the external sign, of regeneration to outward baptism," and sought, as best they could, to reconcile it to their theory, with which it was philosophically inconsistent. They preferred to encounter a logical difficulty rather

than dare to deny an undisputed historical fact. Thus Cœlestius, in the creed which he sent to Rome, says, "Infants must, according to the *rule of the universal Church*, and according to the *declaration of the Gospel*, be baptized in order to the forgiveness of sin; since our Lord has determined that the kingdom of heaven can only be bestowed on the baptized."

Some of the advocates of infant baptism were not content, indeed, to rest its necessity simply upon the doctrine of original sin, and this led to the invention of new virtues in baptism. The simple design of the institution soon became involved in their speculations, and it was not long till it was claimed that it had, and *of itself*, a *real regenerative power*. This corruption of the institution grew out of the over-zealous attempts of many to defend, upon rational grounds, this unscriptural innovation. Hence, Gregory Nazianzen says: "To children, baptism is a seal; (a means of securing human nature in the germ against all moral evil by the higher principle of life communicated to it; for adults it is, moreover, the forgiveness of sin and the restoration of the image degraded and lost by transgression." (Orat. 40, f. 640.) "Chrysostom specifies *ten* different effects of grace wrought in baptism." Isidore, of Pelusium, says it can not be denied that infants should be baptized to cleanse them from the sin transmitted through Adam, but this is not the only reason; it imparted to them a divine regeneration, adoption, justification, fellowship with the Church. The remedy was far more than removal of mere evil. Theodore, of Mopsuestia, taught that baptism, in the case of adults, had a twofold purpose; to bestow on them the forgiveness of sin, and to exalt them by fellowship with Christ to a participation in his freedom from sin, and his moral immutability. In the case of infants the first of these is not included, but they should be baptized in order to receive the new and higher life exempt from sin, and which all beings need for their salvation. The impartation of this new life was a preternatural influence wrought in baptism, but—he was careful to distinguish—through the agency of the Holy Spirit. So far as we can trace it, this acute thinker was the first to maintain that "the water, according to the comparison employed by Christ in his conversation with Nicodemus, stood related to the creative power of God in the new and higher birth, as the body of the mother to the creative power of God in the natural birth."

We need not follow this investigation through the Dark Ages. The scholastic divines adopted the mystical interpretation of the water, according to the allegorical system of Cyprian, and, of course, affirmed, fully, the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins. But, as suited to their habits of logical quibbling, they busied themselves, as to baptism, for the most part, about the kind of fluid in which it might be performed. Some thought, in no other liquid than water; others thought that air, sand, or oil could be used, while others held long and subtile disputes whether beer, broth, fish sauce, mead, or honey-water, lye, or rose-water might be used instead of pure water.

Having, then, brought our investigations down to a period when the writings of the Fathers become a muddy stream, mingled with so many corruptions and silly quibbles that they are of but little worth upon any question, let us pass on to the period of the Reformation. Let it be noted, however, that through even the Dark Ages, whatever *new* notions were attached to baptism, this, of its relation to the forgiveness of sins, was never denied or omitted. It was always held, to use the language of Cœlestius, "to *be the rule of the universal Church*, and *according to the declaration of the Gospel, that baptism was for the remission of sins.*" In the times nearest to the Apostles, this doctrine was taken in its simplest and most practical sense. It was understood that the forgiveness of sins was all a matter of divine mercy and favor, and that, as a law, purely of divine appointment, it was conditioned on faith, repentance, and baptism. This was preached and accepted without any philosophical speculation as to the precise metaphysical sense of the expression. It was accepted as a plain *law* of pardon, the reason or rationale of which the subject did not concern himself particularly about. No matter about the why and the wherefore; it was the Lord's appointed way to salvation, and that was enough. By full conformity to it the sinner was taught that his sins would be forgiven; without it, he was taught they would not be forgiven. It was the "consummation of his change, of his passage from death to life, and, as such, completed his *regeneration.*" Gradually, men began to draw inferences from this command. They philosophized and speculated; and, out of these, the simplicity of the divine arrangement was destroyed, the purity of the truth was corrupted, and the enormous errors of infant baptism and its consequent assumption of *regenerative efficacy in the water of*

baptism grew into acceptance, and, finally, fixed themselves in a theology which, in the practice of infant baptism, has resisted the honest opposition of a pure interpretation of the Word for sixteen centuries.

When Christianity emerged from the Dark Ages it found the doctrine of baptism involved in the greatest superstition by the Roman Catholics. Like all her seven *sacraments,* the Church of Rome taught that baptism had the effect of "imprinting a character upon the soul, which they defined to be a physical quality, that is supernatural and spiritual;" that it "carried along with it such a divine virtue that by the very receiving of it (the *opus operatum*) it is conveyed to the souls of them to whom it is applied;" so that, though one should be in his last agonies, very near past all sense, and incapable of joining any lively acts of his mind with the sacraments, yet would he be justified by them. This is to attach *saving efficacy to the water;* this is "baptismal regeneration," of which we hear so much reckless assertion, often by those who do not understand what is meant by the expression. It is not only without any foundation in Scripture, but is subversive of all true religion, since it tends to set aside the only true conditions of the Gospel, which are faith, repentance, and obedience.

Among the many corruptions of the Church of Rome, against which the Reformation thundered its denunciations, this, of course, was not the least prominent. Her whole doctrine of "sacraments" was one of the most objective points of Luther's fierce and heroic attacks. Her seven sacraments were soon reduced to three, and finally to two: baptism and the Lord's Supper. The doctrine of baptism was defined with great clearness and decision. The Popish corruption of "baptismal regeneration" was promptly detected and rejected, and, in the many *symbols* to which the searching discussions of the times gave rise, the true doctrine of the Scriptures and the Patristic Church was stated with a fullness and harmony that left no ambiguity on the subject.

Of all these *symbols* or *confessions,* that of Augsburg, as it was the first, so it was the most important. It is credited to the pen of Melancthon, but was based upon the previous work of Luther, and became the authorized doctrinal basis of Protestantism in Germany, A. D. 1530. It refutes "the Popish theory that the sacraments are efficacious '*ex opere operato;*' that is, by their intrinsic efficacy without

regard to faith in the recipient, or to the operation of the Holy Spirit;" but, concerning baptism, it affirms: "The Scriptures teach that it is necessary to salvation as a ceremony ordained of God; also, by baptism the grace of God is offered."

The angry contentions which grew out of this confession gave rise to various remodelings or new forms of confession, some of which were in fuller exposition of the Lutheran symbolism, and others, expressive of the views of Calvin. They all, however, are in full harmony on our doctrine of baptism.

In 1551 the *Confessio Saxonica* was drawn up by Melancthon for the use of the Council of Trent. On baptism it says: "I baptize thee; that is, I do witness that by this dipping, thy sins be washed away, and that thou art now received of the true God."

In 1552 the *Confessio Wurtemburgica* was composed by Brentz, for the use of the same council, and it says, speaking of baptism: "I believe and confess that baptism is that sea, into the bottom whereof, as the prophet saith, God doth cast all our sins."

In 1564 the Second Helvetic Confession was gotten up, under the auspices of a body of Swiss theologians, and became the adopted symbol of the Reformed Church in Switzerland generally, and by those, also, of Poland, Hungary, Scotland, and France. It represents the great body of Reformers who received their doctrinal views from Zwingle and Calvin. It says of baptism: "To be baptized in the name of Christ is to be enrolled, entered, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; that is to say, to be called the sons of God, to be purged, also, from the filthiness of sins, and to be endowed with the manifold grace of God for to lead a new and innocent life."

We might quote other modifications of "*symbolical*" writings, of which the times produced so many, and to the same effect, but these must suffice. Let it be observed that they were written in opposition to the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," yet, that they affirm, without hesitation or fear of misapprehension, the great Scriptural and Patristic doctrine of *baptism for the remission of sins.* This is clear from their face, and is corroborated by the more fully elaborated views both of Luther and Calvin, the two greatest spirits of the era that produced them. Luther, attacking the errors of the Romanists as to the sacraments, says: "God has preserved this sacrament [baptism]

alone pure from human traditions. God has said, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' This *promise* of God ought to be preferred to the glory of all works, to all vows, satisfactions, indulgences, and every thing which man has invented. Now, on this promise, received by faith, depends our salvation. If we believe, our heart is strengthened by the Divine promise, and, though a believer should be bereft of all beside, this promise, which he believes, will never forsake him. . . In all his trials it will be his consolation that he can say: 'God is faithful to his promise; I have received the pledge of it in baptism. If God is for me, who can be against me? O how rich is the baptized Christian! Nothing can ruin him but his own refusal to believe." (Daub. Ref., b. vi.) It will be observed how sharply Luther draws the distinction between salvation through baptism *as a work* and as a *promise.* It is *faith in the promise* of God, not merit in the work; but faith expecting and finding the blessing *in the condition of the promise.*

Speaking in a similar strain, he says: "This is not done by changing of a garment, or by any laws or works; but by a new birth, and by the renewing of the inner man, which is done in baptism; as Paul saith: 'All ye that are baptized have put on Christ;' also, 'According to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit.' (Tit. iii, 5.) For, besides, that they who are baptized are renewed and regenerated by the Holy Spirit to a heavenly righteousness and to eternal life, there riseth in them, also, a new light and a new flame. . . . Wherefore to be appareled with Christ according to the Gospel, is not to be appareled with the law or with works, but with an incomparable gift; that is, with the remission of sins, righteousness, peace, consolation, joy of spirit, salvation, life, and Christ himself." (Com. on. Gal., *in loco.*)

Calvin is no less explicit in his affirmation of this uniform doctrine of the great Reformers. Dissenting, as he did, from Luther as to the doctrine of the eucharist, he affirmed equally with him the Scriptural relation of baptism to the remission of sins. He says:

"From baptism our faith derives three advantages, which require to be distinctly considered. The first is that it is proposed to us by the Lord as a symbol and token of our purification; or, to express my meaning more fully, it resembles a legal instrument, properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are canceled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all who

believe to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore," says he, hitting at the doctrine afterward more fully developed by Socinus, "those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered the principal thing in baptism, which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise: 'He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.'"

As he was careful to defend this doctrine against the loose notions of the Socinians on the one hand, so he was equally particular to guard it against the other extreme of "baptismal regeneration." He proceeds, therefore, to add: "In this sense we are to understand what is said by Paul, that Christ sanctifieth and cleanseth the Church 'with the washing of the water by the Word;' and in another place, that, 'According to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit;' and by Peter: 'that baptism doth save us.' For it was not the intention of Paul to signify that our ablution and salvation are completed by the water, or that water contains, in itself, the virtue to purify, regenerate, and renew; nor, did Peter mean that it was the cause of salvation, but only that the knowledge and assurance of it is received in this sacrament."

Thus we see that the doctrine of the various Lutheran and Calvinistic confessions, as more fully explicated by Luther and Calvin themselves, is at one with the Patristic teaching on this subject, and that the constant voice of the great representative exponents of the faith of the Church is, that *baptism is for the remission of sins.*

We pass over from the Continent to England. The "symbolism" of the English Church, like that of the Continental Churches, was of gradual formation. Cranmer and Ridley prepared "The Forty-two Articles of Edward VI," which were adopted by a Synod at London, in 1552. This was revised by the bishops of the English Church, under Elizabeth, and adopted by Parliament in 1571. It is known as "The Thirty-nine Articles." The twenty-fifth article is "Of the sacraments." It declares them to be two: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In the "exposition" of this article by Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum, 1698, he defines what is meant by the term sacrament. "A sacrament," says he, "is an institution of Christ in which some material thing is sanctified by the use of some form of words, in and by which, federal acts of this religion do pass on both sides; on ours by stipulations, professions, or vows, and on God's by his secret

assistances. By these we are also united to the body of Christ; which is the Church. It must be instituted by Christ; . . . . for federal acts, to which a conveyance of Divine grace is tied, can only be instituted by Him who is the author and mediator of this new covenant, and who lays down the rules and conditions of it, and derives the blessings of it by what methods and what channels he thinks fit." These "constituent and necessary parts" of a sacrament, he proceeds to show, are found in baptism. He says: "In baptism there is *matter, water;* there is *form*, the person *dipped or washed*, with words, *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;* there is an institution, *Go preach and baptize;* there is a federal sponsion, *the answer of a good conscience;* there is a blessing conveyed with it, *baptism saves us;* there is *one baptism, as there is one body and one spirit; we are all baptized into one body.*" (Burnet on 39 Art., p. 245.) This article, he says, as published by King Edward, was more explicit than the present form in denying that there was virtue in the sacrament *of itself*, "not as some say, *ex opere operatum;*" but, since the present form "puts the nature of the sacrament in the *worthy receiving*," he contends that it "excludes the doctrine of *opere operatum* as formally as if it had been expressly condemned." (Ibid., p. 242.)

The celebrated "Westminster Assembly" met by a call of Parliament, in 1643. It was composed of representatives of the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and the Independent parties, the Presbyterians predominating. Its main purpose was "to settle the government, liturgy, and the doctrine of the Church of England." It sat for four years and a half, and held 1163 sessions. Both in the Catechism and the Confession which they produced, the uniform teaching of the Church on the doctrine of baptism is stated in the fullest and clearest terms. To the 165th question, "What is baptism?" the answer is explicit. "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself; of remission of sins by his blood and regeneration by his Spirit; of adoption and resurrection unto everlasting life, and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's." And in the confession (Ch.

28, sec. 1) it is said "Baptism is a sacrament, of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the Church, but, also, to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life." This is the language of the celebrated "Westminster Confession." It took the place of the *Confessio Scoticana*, in Scotland, and is the doctrinal basis of the Presbyterian Church both in England and America.

The Episcopalians are no less explicit. In their book of "Common Prayer" the minister is instructed to say, after quoting the Savior, "That none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerated and born anew of water and of the Holy Spirit;" "I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to *these persons* that which, by nature, *they* can not have; that they may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's Holy Church, and be made live *members* of the same." In the prayer, he is instructed to say: "We call upon thee for *these persons*, that *they*, coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of *their* sins by spiritual regeneration." Then, after reading the Savior's conversation with Nicodemus, in John iii, he shall say, in exhortation: "Ye hear, in this Gospel, the express words of our Savior, Christ, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God; whereby, ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament when it may be had." Quoting still further from the Scriptures, the command of the Savior in the commission, as given by Mark, Peter's answer to the Pentecostians, and his strong declaration, in another place, where he says, "Baptism doth also now save us," he is to conclude with these words: "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that he will favorably receive *these* present *persons*, truly repenting and coming unto him by faith; that he will grant *them* remission of *their* sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost."

The Methodist Church follows the Episcopal, adopting the identical words, and we need not repeat them. Since, however, there has been a controversy as to the precise sense in which the term "regeneration" is to be interpreted in this article, whether "in the same large sense as several of the ancient Fathers, or in its more modern

theological interpretation," we shall hear the explication which several of the most honored teachers among the Methodists have given of it. One part of the clergy of the English Church have held the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration" and the *absolute necessity* of baptism unto salvation, even for infants. Against this view there has been a constant protest, especially by the Methodists. John Wesley seems to have had somewhat confused opinions on the subject, yet, while to justify infant baptism he affirms its logical necessity, it is evident that he sentimentally rejected it in the case of believers. He says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, unless this be washed away by baptism, it cleaves to them." This is very like "baptismal regeneration;" still, it may be distinguished from it by a refinement of metaphysics satisfactory to some; but he expresses himself more fully in a passage which is quoted in "Doctrinal Tracts," published by order of the General Conference, New York, 1825. It says: "What are the *benefits* we receive by baptism? is the next point to be considered; and the first of these is the washing away the guilt of original sin by the application of the merits of Christ's death." Again: "By baptism we, who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this regeneration, which our Church, in so many places, ascribes to baptism, is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.' This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, (John iii, 5,) 'Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.' By water, then, as a mean, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is also called by the Apostle 'the washing of regeneration.' Our Church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done; nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament." This may be taken as a fair statement of the doctrine held by this eminent teacher among the Methodists, and, also, of the higher class of doctrinal teachers of the whole denomination.

Among later exponents of the doctrine of the Methodist Church, we know of no name that deserves to stand higher than that of Richard Watson. Commenting on the passage in 1 Peter iii, 20, he says: "It is thus that we see how St. Peter preserves the correspondence

between the act of Noah in preparing the ark as an act of faith, by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is also obviously an act of faith, in order to the remission of sins or the obtaining a good conscience before God." Again: "The whole passage can only be consistently taken to teach us that baptism is the outward sign of our entrance into God's covenant of mercy, and that when it is an act of true faith it becomes an instrument of salvation, like that act of faith in Noah, by which, when moved with fear, he 'prepared an ark to the saving of his house,' and survived the destruction of an unbelieving world." (Theo. Inst., p. 630.) This is clear, and we presume is a fair statement of the doctrine of the representative *theologians* of this great denomination. Doubtless, there are some *scribes* in this, as in other denominations, that write a good deal on this subject, who, if not ignorant of the teachings of their great men, seldom trouble themselves to harmonize their crudities either with their own recognized theologians, or with the Scriptures. But we do not deem it pertinent to our purpose to quote from writers whose opinions are not of standard authority.*

In tracing this long and unbroken line of teaching on our subject, we have, so far, omitted to refer to the views of the early and later "Dissenters." We must now notice them. We can only do so very briefly. Down to the tenth century they are known in history as Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians, Paterines, etc.; afterwards, as Waldenses, Albigenses, and German Anabaptists. They have left but few doctrinal statements. There is enough, however, to show that they did not differ from the universally-received doctrine of baptism.

The Novatians took their name from Novatian, who was a candidate for the Bishopric of Rome (A. D. 251) against Cornelius. Defeated in the contest, mainly upon the ground of irregularity in his baptism, he separated from the Catholic party, with his friends, and is known in history as the "Schismatical Bishop of Rome." It is agreed, however, that "he held the same doctrine that the Church did," and separated only upon the ground of Catholic corruptions and laxity in discipline. "He was the first who publicly began to practice

*To these distinguished names we might add many others, who, with equal clearness, affirm our doctrine; such as, Gerhardus, Buddeus, Deylingius, Vossius, Isaac Ambrose, Dr. Fiddes, Gee, Dr. Waterland, Dr. Whitby, Bishop Wilson, Dr. Featley, Burkitt, Dr. Scott, *et multos alios.*

rebaptization, and upon the grounds: first, that baptism was necessary; second, that the baptism of a corrupt Church was no baptism. He claimed that he and his followers were the true Church; for the rest, they were wicked and profane; such as by baptism could cleanse no man unless they first did purify themselves."

The Donatists arose in Carthage, A. D. 300. When Cæcilian was ordained bishop of Carthage, they separated from the Church upon the ground that he was a *traditor;* one who had delivered up to the persecutor, Dioclesian, their sacred books to be burned. They regarded him as an apostate, "denied the validity of baptism as administered by the Church of Rome, and rebaptized all who left its communion to unite with them. In doctrinal sentiments they were agreed with both the Catholics and the Novatians." (Benedict's Hist. of the Bap., p. 8.) We have abundantly shown what the universally-received doctrine of baptism was at this time, so far as it related to the remission of sins, and may, therefore, conclude that *it* was held by both Novatians and Donatists.

The Paulicians had their rise about the middle of the seventh century. They agreed with the Novatians and Donatists in repudiating the baptism of the Church of Rome, and practiced rebaptization. Gibbon says of them "that in the practice, or at least in the theory of the sacraments, the Paulicians were inclined to abolish all visible objects of worship, and the words of the Gospel were, in their judgments, the baptism and communion of the faithful." Whatever heretical speculations they may have fallen into, here at least they stood upon Apostolic ground. We need not follow this obscure line of "Dissenters" through all the many names that were given them—we are warranted in believing, in most cases, by their persecutors—nor expose the fact that, through the sympathy of a common opposition to the Church of Rome, men holding nearly all sorts of opinions were united together, frequently to the discredit of their cause and the reproach of the large number, who were actuated by a lofty devotion to Apostolic Christianity. It may be said in general, that whether Waldenses, Albigenses, German Anabaptists, or whatever other name they may appear under, their peculiarity was a fearless and irrepressible *practical* protest against Catholic corruptions, infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, and the arrogance of the clergy. According to Twist, a Baptist writer, "it is manifest

from the Testimonies and Confessions delivered in that age—1100—they confessed that baptism without faith is *ineffectual to salvation.* And Mehring, another Baptist writer, explaining the saying of the Waldenses and Albigenses, that "baptism had neither efficacy nor power," says: "This they meant of infant baptism; for they highly esteemed the baptism which is administered according to the ordinance of Christ."

The testimony afforded by the teachings and practice of this line of "Dissenters" is valuable. At the end, nearest the Apostolic age, it is unambiguous and emphatic. As we descend into the dark ages it is less distinct, though in no wise contradictory. As we might expect, however, long opposition to the extreme of the Catholic doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," and intimate affiliation through common persecutions, with all sorts of speculatists, gradually and naturally led to a compromise of the Apostolic and Patristic doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, and the adoption of vague and incomplete statements both of the benefits and the design of the ordinance. Yet in several "Confessions of Faith of the Waldenses," this doctrine is stated with tolerable fullness. Perrin, in his "Histoire des Vaudois," published at Geneva, 1619, gives us two of these. In the first, supposed to have been written about A. D. 1120, the twelfth article reads:

"We consider the sacraments (baptism and the Lord's Supper) as signs of holy things, or as the visible emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper, and even necessary, that believers use these symbols, or visible forms, when it can be done. Notwithstanding which, we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs, when they have neither place nor opportunity of observing them."

In the second, referred also to the twelfth century, they say:

"The sacraments of the Church of Christ are two, baptism and the Lord's Supper; and in the latter Christ has instituted the receiving of both kinds, both for priests and people."

This is surely vague enough for Arian, Socinian, or any other latitudinarian sectary of that or the present age.

Sleiden, in his "History of the Reformation," gives us a "Third Confession," which he says the Waldenses residing in the South of France sent to the King to remove the prejudices, because of which they had been doomed to extermination. The seventh article reads:

"We believe that in the ordinance of baptism the water is the visible and external sign which represents to us that which, by virtue of God's invisible oper-

ation, is within us; namely, the renovation of our minds, and the mortification of our members through [the faith of] Jesus Christ. And by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people—previously confessing and declaring our faith and change of life."

It is evident from these Confessions that the Waldenses were but little accustomed to use precise and scientific statements of doctrine. They make no attempt to conform the style of their Confessions to that of the Scriptures. They were, doubtless, bound together more by a common *practice* than a common *doctrine.* Baptism was held to be a positive institution of the New Testament, and must be submitted to as such, precisely as it had been commanded by the Savior. It was the immersion of a penitent believer—nothing more, nothing less. Rebaptization of such as had been only sprinkled, whether infants or adults, followed as a plain practical inference—and beyond this they did not speculate much about the matter. Speculative views were no bar to fellowship, where the practice was the same; and among them we find the first formal statements of Socinianism. The Catechism and Confession of Cracow—1574—declares that it was published to remove "reproaches cast upon the Anabaptists." It is, however, distinctly Socinian. Its *fifth* article says:

"Baptism is the immersion in water, and the emersion of a person who believes the Gospel and exercises repentance, in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, or in the name of Jesus Christ; whereby he publicly professes, that by the grace of God the Father, he has been washed, *ablutum esse,* in the blood of Christ, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, from all his sins; so that being ingrafted into the body of Christ, he may mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the Celestial Adam, in the firm assurance of eternal life after the resurrection."

Here we have the first clear and distinct announcement of a doctrine of baptism, totally different from that which, we have seen, was universally recognized, from the days of the Apostles down to the great symbols of the Reformation, both on the Continent and in England. Instead of an act, which is performed with a view to the reception of the Divine pardon, promised in connection with it, and for the following grace of the Spirit, it is only a public declaration by the party that his *sins have been pardoned!* The conceptions are totally distinct. The one can not be made to mean the other—one is Socinian, the other evangelical.

Passing over into England, we find "Dissenters" appearing as Baptists. They were known, about the beginning of the seventeenth century, as General and Particular Baptists. The former were

organized, under John Smyth, in 1608; the latter, under Spilsbury, in 1633. These, for a long time, differed principally on the doctrine of personal election and reprobation; but in the course of a hundred years the General Baptists became divided, and rapidly declined in numbers and influence. They "tolerated persons of all sects." We find prominent among them such men as Gale, James Foster, Whiston, and Emlyn, all Arians or Socinians. Their Confession of 1660, as published by Dr. Whiston, was "so general and vague in its articles, that all Christian sects, with the exception of a few points, could embrace it." (Mos. iii, p. 218, n. 32.)

The Particular Baptists were Calvinistic. They were on the most friendly terms with the *Independents* or *Congregationalists*. Often both sects worshiped together, and were under the same pastors. In 1689 they held a General Assembly in London, and adopted a Confession, which is expressed very much in the words of the Westminster Confession as to doctrine, but in discipline and order it is independent, and accords with the Savoy Confession. The article on baptism reads: "Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being ingrafted into him; of remission of sins; and his giving unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life."

This article explicitly affirms a relation between baptism and the remission of sins, but it is ambiguous. A *sign* may refer to an act *future*, *concomitant*, or *past*. The last of these is the sense in which Baptists take the article, and this is not the sense of Acts ii, 38, nor the sense of the Westminster divines, from whom they borrowed the expression. While this Confession does not adopt the language of the Socinian Confession of Cracow (1674), it is interpreted, by many, so as to mean but little more than is taught in that heretical symbol. They make it a sign that their sins *have been forgiven*, or, else, they ignore its relation to the forgiveness of sins altogether; hence, in the Declaration of Faith published about thirty years ago, by the Baptist Convention of New Hampshire, this view of baptism is left out altogether. It says: "Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to show forth, in a solemn and beautiful emblem, our faith in a crucified, buried, and risen Savior, with its purifying power, and that it is

a prerequisite to the privileges of a Church relation, and to the Lord's Supper."

This is, truly, a meager statement of this divine institution. An emblematic showing forth of our faith! Does this exhaust the teaching of the Scriptures on this subject? Is it in harmony with the unbroken doctrine of the Church from the Apostolic times? It drops out of the doctrine of the Baptists all allusion to the remission of sins, and to the new birth; and sinks to the level of the heretical views of the Socinians, which degrades baptism to the rank of a *mere ceremony*. It was against this "imagination" that Calvin said: "It does not consider that which is the principal thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.'"

We have now completed the first division of our subject: The Historical Examination of the relation of Baptism to the Remission of Sins. From the first, we have seen it affirmed, without ambiguity or qualification, that baptism is that act of obedience in which we receive the promise of the forgiveness of sins; that it is the divinely-instituted external sign of the internal graces of pardon, in which the Lord assures us that all our sins are canceled by the blood of Christ. This Scriptural doctrine, as to the design of baptism, we have traced from Barnabas down through all the great symbols of the Church, and through the explications of all the great representative teachers in the Church. We have seen it defended against the Catholic superstition of *baptismal regeneration* on the one hand, and the Arian and Socinian heresy of a *mere ceremony* on the other. We have seen that loose and vague notions as to its design first made their appearance among "evangelical sects," through the influence of rationalistic heresies which sought to disparage the use of all outward symbols of grace, and so to reduce Christianity to little more than a philosophy of human consciousness, or the empiricism of sensuous experience. Against both of these errors the united voice of the venerated teachers of all antiquity comes down to us in earnest remonstrance, calling us to return to the pure fountains of all true knowledge of this great doctrine of the divine favor. To these, in another article, we shall invite attention; when we shall consider the second division of our subject: *What is the Doctrine of Scripture, as to the relation between Baptism and the Remission of Sins.*

VI.—THE LINE OF LIFE.

TO have a life of three-score years and ten miniatured within the reach of a single glance, to have its dim, smooth unrelief stereoscoped into living forms and distances, and to have its beginning, middle, and end marked off and defined by a plain, simple, historic narrative in the Old Testament Scriptures, must be, when well understood, a matter of first-class importance to all who wish to comprehend this life below. Especially is this true when the picture represents our religious life; embracing our transgressions, repentance, baptism, trials, death, and glorification in the heavenly rest. The story of Israel's travels from Canaan, through Egypt, and back to Canaan again, furnishes just such an image of life. This typical sketch of life is the more important to us, as it not only marks, with clearness, the grand epochs in the Christian journey, but settles, beyond dispute, several of the most controverted theological questions of our times.

Before eliminating the salient points of this history, and showing their application to individual life, it will be scarcely necessary to prove it to be typical, as this is assumed by all writers and preachers as so plain that no lengthened argument is needed. It may be quite sufficient to refer the reader to 1st Cor. x, 6–11, where Paul declares that "All these things happened to the Jews for *ensamples to us*," and that "they were for *our* admonition." We are, therefore, authorized to seize the prominent features of that account, and make them parallel to events in the Christian life. The main facts to be thus noticed, are the following:

1. *Their going down into Egypt was a type of our going down into sin; the house of bondage.* In Canaan they were not in bondage; in Egypt they were. In childhood's innocency there is no bondage in sin. We do not affirm that Israel's state in Canaan was intended as a type of childhood any farther than its being a state free from bondage, and, so far as it goes, it refutes the old dogma of infant damnation on account of what is called "original sin," and shows that no man is in condemnation till he goes "down into" sin personally. We

are nowhere commanded to repent of Adam's sin, but of our own sins.

2. The children of Abraham received some temporal advantages by going down into Egypt; corn at first, and then the fertile fields of Goshen to live in. But Joseph died, and another king arose that knew not Joseph, and reduced them all to the condition of bondmen. So when sinners go down into their house of bondage, there is generally some temporary enjoyment, and promise of more. There may be temporary gain in theft, fraud, falsehood; and some temporary pleasure in drinking, debauchery, and carousal; but the land of Goshen soon becomes a land of bondage, and the sins that first enticed soon begin to enslave the soul, and convince it that every pleasurable sin concealed a baited hook intended for its destruction. It can not now deny that

> "One day within the courts
> Where my dear Lord hath been,
> Is sweeter than ten thousand years
> Of pleasurable sin."

3. Having once gone into Egypt, and having acknowledged some favors from the king, he began to feel their subjugation to be very practicable and very real. They not only had to bear the burdens already imposed, but greater ones at his discretion. Are not sinners compelled to obey their master as long as they are in the kingdom of darkness? Can they leave off service as long as they are under the taskmasters? Can they obtain a furlough? Does not the poor drunkard often feel his chains, complain of them, and then do worse than ever? He must now make brick without straw, and yet furnish the same number as before. Is not this a real slavery? "The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be;*" that is, while it is carnal, remaining in Egypt, it can not serve God "in the wilderness." Moreover, let any who thinks he can leave off the service of sin so easily undertake to do so, and to join the Church, and he 'll find the taskmasters at work to make the way more difficult than he supposed, and to convince him that Pharaoh will not let him go at once. Sin within and sin without, the pointed sneer, the faults of others, and a scarce believing heart, will all dispute his passage into the kingdom of God.

4. At this crisis of their servile sufferings, the Lord sent Moses,

from the land of Midian, to propose their deliverance, and to prove his divine commission by wondrous miracles in the presence of the king and all the people. Without this "deliverer" redemption for them was out of the question. They were possessed of no military force with which to break the yoke of their bondage; they had no money with which to buy themselves away, and so must depend entirely upon an extrinsic force for their deliverance. This prefigured the necessity of the advent of our Redeemer to this world of sin and bondage, to deliver the souls of men from the empire of Satan. Jesus, likewise, demonstrated his divine mission by "mighty signs and wonders which God wrought by him," in order that the bondmen might believe him, and be delivered by him. And just at this point all uncertainty as to the necessity of faith and the nature of faith is dissipated, as any one can see why it was necessary for Israel to believe on Moses if they would be saved by him. Their deliverance, without following him, was impossible, and their following him was equally impossible without faith in him as God's messenger. Moreover, their faith in him was strong enough and saving enough whenever it moved them to forsake the house of bondage and follow him to the sea, and through the sea into the wilderness. And whenever a sinner has faith enough in Christ to forsake the bondage of sin, and follow him on to his baptism, and through it into the kingdom of God—into the wilderness state—then has he saving faith, and not before. Nor is there any mystery in believing on Jesus more than in believing on Moses. Their belief in Moses was not an idle conviction that God sent him on a divine errand, but, as their own happiness was deeply involved in what he proposed to do for them, their hearts were interested, and, hating their old masters and his service, they believed on Moses with all their hearts. This so manifestly parallels our faith in Christ as to need no statement of the penitent's nausea of his former condition, of his cordial reception of the proposed redemption, and of the simplicity of that act of faith which casts all our care on Him that cares for us.

5. Before starting for the Red Sea each family was commanded to kill a *passover* lamb, and sprinkle its blood upon the "door posts and upon the lintels of the doors," so that the angel of death, flying over all Egypt that night, to destroy the first-born of man and beast—Pharaoh's last plague—might, on seeing that "blood of sprinkling,"

pass over such houses without harming them. This paschal lamb was one of the boldest types of the Jewish religion, and fairly adumbrated "Christ our Passover, who was sacrificed for us." The death of that lamb prevented the death of Israel's first-born. It, in a very important sense, died *instead* of the first-born, showing what Christ's death and atonement have done for us. He died that we might never die; "He closed his eyes to show us God;" he died in the world, not in the Church; in Egypt, not in the wilderness; and blessed are they upon whom shall be found his "blood of sprinkling" in the day when the angel of death shall execute judgment upon all who stand upon the left hand of God.

But here the hosts of Israel stand at the edge of the Red Sea in their front, Pharaoh's armies pursuing in their rear, and impassable steeps on their right and on their left. And here will we linger awhile with them in their critical position, before seeing them "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." If there is any fitness in this history as typical of things in the Christian dispensation; if Egypt represents our bondage in sin; if their baptism unto Moses represents our baptism unto Christ; if the wilderness journey was a type of our warfare from our baptism until our Jordan of death which bounds the heavenly Canaan; if "all these things happened to them for examples to us," and "for our learning," then may several important questions of our times be placed beyond the limits of reasonable disputation.

First. Is Christian baptism (to those who have a chance to know the truth) essential to salvation? This requires no long argument if the type is worth any thing. Was it essential to the salvation of the Jews from the hands of their enemies? Was their faith, and even their work, so far as they had gone, sufficient to deliver them? They had believed on Moses; the passover had been slain; they had formally forsaken the brick-yards of their taskmasters, and were standing on the shore of the Red Sea. Were they saved? Out of danger while on the enemies' soil? Or was it essential that they be "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" to escape a recapture into a worse condition than before? The true answer takes possession of the mind before we write it. Is it, then, sufficient for us to believe on the Savior—the true passover sacrificed for us—to forsake the practice of sin, and to stand at the very waters of

Christian baptism? or must we actually be baptized into Christ in order to escape our enemies, which are our sins? Is baptism, then, a non-essential, and are we saved from our sins by faith alone? Our answer is: "He that believeth *and* is baptized shall be saved."

Second. Do bodily acts of obedience to Christ ever discount the strength and value of faith? It is tacitly, and sometimes explicitly, assumed that if baptism be made one of the conditions of pardon of sin, faith is more or less damaged as a justifying principle—that faith can not co-operate with obedience in bringing us to the blood of Christ without being diluted, if not vitiated, by such company. But if the Jews had less faith in God or Moses after the passage of the Red Sea than before, it is contrary to the convictions of all intelligent men, even of those who believe in salvation by faith alone. Did they regard their deliverance less a matter of grace after their baptism than before? Did their walking through the Red Sea, as an act of obedience, win a part of the honors from God, and discredit the efficiency of his right hand in their redemption? All the principles of mental and moral philosophy, bearing upon this question, go to show that appropriate action expressive of our faith and feelings tends only to strengthen them; that when the inward principles and emotions are translated into open action, the one is never weakened, but fortified, by the other. Baptism into Christ can, therefore, never damage the *faith* of Christ, nor interfere with the grace of God; but, when properly understood and obeyed, co-operates with all other means of grace to develop our spiritual life.

Again: this passage furnishes a definition of the word *baptize*. The Jews were baptized, but the Egyptians, although drowned in the sea, were not baptized. Baptism does not mean simply a submerging, but includes the idea, also, of rising out of the water. But few readers have noticed that Paul, in Col. ii, 12, has given precisely this definition of the word as used in the Christian Scriptures. "Buried with him in baptism wherein (in which, *en too*) you are risen with him;" that is, in which baptism you are risen, the article *too* relating to baptism understood. Then it would read: "Buried with him in baptism, in which baptism you are risen with him;" so that the meaning of the word is not filled by a mere *submerging*, the *rising*, also, being a part of that meaning. The Jews, then, were baptized because they were not only "in the cloud and in the sea," but emerged from them;

a thing that could not be said of the Egyptians. So when we leave Egypt, following Christ our leader, we are baptized unto him by an immersion in, and a resurrection out of, the water, to walk in newness of life through the wilderness lying between this and the Jordan of death.

The *design* of Christian baptism may also be determined by this typical Jewish baptism. So far from being a non-essential to them, it was the dividing line between the land of bondage and of freedom; it marked the boundaries of each, and had to be passed before they were beyond the danger of re-captivity. As soon, however, as they had all safely placed glad feet on the other side of the sea they realized, not only that they were out of the enemy's territory, but saw, in their rear, Pharaoh and all his hosts struggling in the fatal billows. Now, as our sins are our enemies, this "ensample" shows that when the soul of the penitent passes from "the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son," it not only escapes the power of the enemy sin, but sin itself is destroyed, is forgiven, is taken away from that soul "as far as the East is from the West." It does not promise that his Christian journey through the wilderness shall furnish "no foes for him to face," but that all his *past* sins are remitted—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—from his sins committed before that time; "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins" that are past. Our baptism is not a mere outside ceremony for putting away the filth of the flesh, as a Jewish washing, but is "the answer of a good conscience;" which implies a deliverance from sin. From these passages and analogies, then, it avails but little for any one to deny that Christian baptism, administered to a proper subject, is included among the conditions of pardon. No mere transcendentalism, that seeks to commune with God without the intervention of Christian ordinances, receives any encouragement from these Old Testament types that were "written for our learning." Nor is that formalism countenanced which depends upon the mere ceremony of baptism, as administered to infants and unconverted sinners; since all the historic facts in the case go to prove that a preparation of heart was first secured in every family and every individual servant under Pharaoh—they felt their chains; were "weary and heavy ladened;" they believed on Moses, their deliverer; they deserted their former master;

incurred the hazards of desertion, and fled to the Red Sea—all this heart preparation before they *could* be "baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Without these antecedents *their baptism was an impossibility.* To call the mere ceremony a baptism is an absurdity. The baptism of an infant, therefore, never was any thing less than an absurdity, and the formal baptisms of unconverted adults in certain Church and State religions, for State reasons more than for spiritual blessings, is not only absurd, but thoroughly sinful—a mere husk; a shell without a seed; a shadow without a substance, and a form without the power of Godliness.

While it will now be admitted that the Jews were not baptized in form only, it may also be admitted that Pharaoh's attempt to be baptized, without due preparation of heart, was decidedly a failure. He attempted to be baptized as Israel was, but got only half through with it—he was buried in the sea, but did not rise out of it. The ordinance that was ordained unto life for those prepared for it was death to those not fitted for it by the necessary antecedents. The religion of heaven is the "savor of life unto life, or of death unto death;" and to venture, either then or now, to desecrate its ordinances is a fearful hazard to the soul. Whoever attempts to be baptized into Christ without the proper spiritual antecedents will both fail to reach the heavenly Canaan, and fail, even, of the wilderness state of the Church of God. Just as a marriage ceremony without a previously-secured affection between the parties is a graceless abortion in the attempt to unite a true husband and wife, so the baptism of an infant or unconverted adult is a religious abortion, injurious to man and offensive to God; and, hence, the mere fact that infants passed through the Red Sea with their parents, no more constituted a baptism for them than it did for the flocks and herds that also passed through, there being no faith in either of them. Were the flocks baptized into Moses? If not, Why? What was lacking to constitute their passage a baptism also? The Jewish fathers were baptized into Moses as their leader, their *accepted* leader, the leader in whom they *believed* as the sent of God for their deliverance; so that baptism could be predicated of no creature accompanying them that was incapable of trusting the deliverer. The application is easy, and needs not that we should say that none incapable of casting all his care on Jesus Christ can ever be baptized into him. Christianity

is a spiritual religion, demanding a renewal in the "spirit of your mind," and forbidding all drawing nigh with the mouth or the whole body while the heart is far from God. Such being the qualifications of a candidate for baptism, and such being its position between the land of bondage and that of redemption, it can not be a *non-essential,* but must be included in the terms of pardon and full reconciliation to God.

All we have said, thus far, relates directly to the salvation of the *sinner,* and his progress from the first consciousness of his chains until his full redemption from his sins that are past. Here we undertake to mark his *Christian* course through this wilderness of sin to the Jordan of death. The first great effort is to leave the world and come into the Church; the second is to live the Christian life so as not to fall in the wilderness. It can not be doubted that this latter introduces a series of tender solicitudes "lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of us should seem to come short of it." The fact that many of them fell in the wilderness, is very suggestive of our danger. Those who fell had, in the first instance, believed on Moses, had boldly left Egypt, had been baptized aright, had escaped their enemies, and had entered on their Church life in "the congregation in the wilderness," but fell because they did not continue in the faith. "With whom was he grieved forty years? Was it not with them who believed not, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?" "Take heed, therefore, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God."

To point this exhortation with incident, and to develop the salient analogies found in these "ensamples," the following specifications may be made:

1. Soon after their entrance into the wilderness many a heart turned back to Egypt, longing for its flesh-pots, leeks, and onions. Their circumstances were all new and untried. They did not feel settled fairly in their new relations. The change was very great and sudden; the desert dry and barren; Canaan was not in view, while Egypt was not far off, and it was natural for them to prefer a certainty, even if not so pleasant, to the unknown dangers and trials of the wilderness.

Those ministers whose hearts have been most tenderly in sympathy with young converts, and who have most intimately known their

experiences of hopes, and fears, and temptations, well know what is meant when I say that very often those who have just come into the kingdom of God, the Church in the wilderness, after a few weeks or months have their spiritual trials, their discouragements, their spiritual conflicts, in which they greatly need the confidence, counsel, and spiritual acquaintance of pastors or other spiritual helpers to show them the riches of their inheritance, to teach them to pray, and to comfort their hearts. Even in the marriage relation a little time is required for the young husband and wife to become so accustomed to each other, and so adjusted to their new relation, that they can *feel* the lasting relation to be nearer and dearer than father or mother. A little time must be thrown between their single and married state before they realize that an impassable gulf lies between them and their single state with their parents. The analogous period in the young Christian's life needs especial care on the part of the ministry. Leave them not standing on the shore of the Red Sea; start them over the desert; visit them; start them in Bible reading, private prayer, and prayer meetings of their own; let each one feel he has something to do in the vineyard; have them feed upon the heavenly manna, and drink of the Spiritual Rock; tell them of the land flowing with milk and honey; let them not imagine an easy, unobstructed road to heaven, but encourage them to fight the good fight of faith, and they will never fall, but so "an entrance shall be ministered abundantly unto them unto the kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ."

When the young Christian enters the wilderness state he must not expect this barren world to furnish him the food his spirit wants. Manna must come down from heaven for his daily bread.

> "This world can never give
> The bliss for which we sigh."

Can an immortal soul be satisfied with the praise of men, with riches, with worldly pleasure? After all the leeks and flesh-pots of Egypt will there not remain that "aching void the world can never fill?" When ill-defined uneasiness of soul is experienced; when unrest and lack of happiness, not easily referable to any visible cause, is felt, be assured it is simply a lack of spiritual food, nothing but soul-starvation, that can be relieved by nothing but a closer walk with God in Bible-study, prayer, active benevolence, and a holier communion.

And when ministers find members almost dying for want of the bread of life, let there be no scolding and upbraiding, but encourage and feed them with sweet manna from God, and you will lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees. Teach them to pray *daily*. God did not send down manna enough for a week at a time, but only for one day; and the Savior teaches us to pray, "Give us this day our *daily* bread;" involving the necessity of daily prayer. This spiritual manna is supplied to those who ask for it all through the wilderness on to the very edge of the river of death. But, as manna never fell for them after they entered Canaan, we may expect that the Lord will supply our spiritual wants in heaven in some way different from that in this world. Of that we can not speak, for we know not what we shall be; we only know "that when he shall appear we shall be like him, and shall see him as he is."

The pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, that accompanied Israel from the land of Egypt to the borders of Canaan, represented the Word of God, which leads the way from earth to heaven. It was darkness to the Egyptians, but light to the Jews. So the god of this world "blinds the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine unto them." Religion must forever be a mystery to those who believe not on Jesus. As the door of prophecy is said to be "unlocked from the inside," the light of the Gospel is seen by those who follow the Leader. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrines whether they be of God." A man "must be born again to see the kingdom of God." The cloud was not only a light, but a guide. Whenever it arose and moved forward, the Levites struck the tents of Israel, and all moved after it. Whenever it stopped, they pitched their tents and awaited its further demonstrations; and those who move as the Word of the Lord shall direct, will neither fall nor be lost in the wilderness; but will reach the waters of death in safety, in the blessed hope of a resurrection on the other side of Jordan. And as the high-priest stood in the midst of the river till all God's chosen had safely passed its deep channel, so when we pass the "valley of the shadow of death," we 'll fear no evil, for "His rod and His staff will comfort us." Some were young and some were old, yet Canaan was a rest for all, and if we die in infancy, "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" if not until old age, after we

have struggled long and hard for heaven, our rest will be all the sweeter for having fought our way through. And when the dews of Jordan have settled upon the placid brow, and we know "the crossing must be near," and the goodly land almost in sight, then

> "Jehovah rules the tide,
> And the waters will divide;
> While the ransomed hosts will shout,
> We have come! We have come!"

Three reflections shall now close this essay.

1. The Lord might have saved Israel from Egypt without bringing them through the Red Sea; for they could have passed around that sea to the north, through the *Isthmus of Suez*. Their baptism into Moses was not a geographical necessity; for they could have gone from Egypt to the Jordan without touching, or even seeing, the Red Sea, or any other sea. So God might have ordained that we should be delivered from our Egyptian bondage without being baptized into Christ. Baptism is no necessity in the nature of things, but it is God's ordinance—a positive ordinance—for the institution of which he is answerable to no one; for, if the thing formed has no right to say to him that formed it, "Why hast thou made me thus?" surely, the ruined sinner has no right to say to his Redeemer, "Why hast thou saved me in this manner?" All we can say is, that we find this ordinance on our way from Egypt to Canaan, and placed right between Egypt and the wilderness, and if we intend to go to heaven on the highway of the redeemed, it will be safer not to undertake a journey, without a leader, through the Isthmus of Suez; for neither Moses nor Jesus went that way.

2. Israel wandered about in the wilderness for forty years, during which time all the 600,000 armed men, save two, fell through unbelief. They might have passed through in forty days had they been faithful and obedient, as they promised at Mt. Sinai. But they could not learn obedience without those things which they suffered, and were unfit for Canaan—as unfit as many of us are for heaven while in our crude and half-sanctified state in the Church. It might be greatly to our damage to hasten away to heaven before we are ripe for it. It is not well to pluck green fruit. The Lord keeps us in the wilderness till we are weary of the journey; till our sandals are

almost worn out; till we are anxious to leave the sands of the desert; till we

> "——Long to lay this aching heart
> And painful head beneath the soil;
> To slumber in that drear abode,
> From all our toil."

Then will heaven refresh the weary soul with "Love, rest, and home."

> "Then shalt thou walk in soft, white light, with kings and priests abroad;
> And thou shalt Summer high in bliss upon the hills of God."

3. Though we have not seen, as yet, our heavenly home, we have often received assurance of its glory, its verdure, and its abundance. We have also tasted of the grapes of Eschol. Moses and Elias having been over to see the good land, came back with rich clusters to the moment of transfiguration, whose sweetness so bewildered poor Peter, that he thought that mere taste of heaven was all he ever would desire. Sometimes it is given us to ascend on Pisgah's top to breathe from the gardens of God, and to see, through a glass, darkly, the rest that remains for the people of God. And having tasted of heaven, and loved it, and seeing nothing but Jordan rolling quietly between us and it, we can calmly await the call of Him who loved us, and gave himself for us. "And now unto Him that is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to God, the only wise, be glory and dominion, majesty and power, both now and forever. Amen."

VII.—MYSTICAL OR TRANSCENDENTAL SKEPTICISM AND WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

OF all the negative arguments which go to confirm the truth of Christianity, there is, perhaps, none more striking than that which may be drawn from the ever-shifting and contradictory attacks of Infidelity. Truth has, in itself, the element of immutability; while falsehood is almost sure to change. Hence, every advocate, whose business it is to sift testimony, knows *immutability* as a test of truth; or, at least, *mutability* as a certain test of falsehood.

The philosophy of Hume brought an objection against the miracles of Christ as being incredible; because they are, evidently, out of the reach of our experience; that no one could believe a miracle unless it came under his own observation. This argument is purely materialistic, and would expel *faith* from the universe if all testimony were subjected to the same treatment; for what comes under our own observation is not a matter of *belief*, but of knowledge. Hence, to use one of their technicalities, "the empirical Sciences" are matters of knowledge, and not of faith.

It is hardly necessary for us to say that Hume's position was ably refuted by Dr. Campbell, and many others.

The Old School of Skepticism always attacked the Bible in its external evidences—its monuments and history. But, since the discovery of the key to the cuneiform character, such a cloud of witnesses have arisen, from the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, to sustain the accuracy of Sacred History, that the enemies of Revelation have been compelled to entirely change their tactics. Perhaps no skeptic of the French school, in the last half of the last century, could have been made to believe that Infidels of the nineteenth century would blush to use the sophistry of Hume. So thoroughly have all the old positions of skepticism been refuted that they are now obliged to make new issues, and invoke the aid of the Mystical and Transcendental Philosophy.

The extravagant theories of Geology, which gave the unbeliever so much exultation, are now tumbling down about the ears of these

Babel-builders. Skeptics themselves can scarce refrain from smiling at the credulity of their dupes, and, with reason, laugh at the weakness of those commentators who sought to accommodate the Bible to their pretended discoveries. But, as all we can say against these exploded systems of attack on the Bible can have but little effect upon the modern unbeliever, we will drop the curtain of silence over its ancient short-comings, and say of Infidelity, as Virgil said of quite a different character, "*Varium et mutabile semper!*" and draw from its history the consoling reflection, that skeptics have never yet found a tenable objection against the Bible—not one with which they can continue satisfied.

But, as we are now to look for the Bible to be attacked by the indirections of Mysticism and Transcendentalism, we must pay our addresses to this new method of aggression. True arguments are apt to improve with age, while false ones owe all their power to their freshness. Objections which but a few years ago looked formidable, are now ridiculous.

This new aspect of Mystical skepticism, as now arrayed against the Bible, presents some very interesting phases. The leaders in this new movement direct their attacks against the *morality* of the New Testament, and profess to *transcend* that holy book in the sanctity of their love for humanity. They profess to believe that the New Testament was good for the time of its promulgation; but we, of the nineteenth century, should progress far beyond its ancient and crude morality. They seek to incorporate their fancied improved morality with some great popular reform, so as gradually to suggest and introduce the notion that the Bible stands in the way of popular progress, and that, under the reign of Transcendentalism, we are to reach a higher point of happiness than was ever dreamed of among those who enjoy the peace and love of Christianity. They are entirely oblivious of the fact that this same kind of superior blessedness was promised to the Infidels of France before the great Revolution came and swept them away in all their dreams of fame and happiness.

But, in order to get up a movement of the requisite popularity, they have not scrupled to lay hold of some of the most radical principles of New Testament morality, and by leading off in these, and outstripping the Church, they hope to appear Transcendentalists indeed, transcending professed Christians in the transcendent virtues

of their own religion. It is but a few years since these men attempted to lead the antislavery and anti-war movement, and so cast the Church into the shade on the questions of liberty and peace, that they might treat with contempt those who are the representatives of that institution which should be the "pillar and ground of the truth."

But, not to turn aside to moralize on this gloomy picture of meditated fraud, we will call attention to what now appears to be the intended hobby for the coming canvass.

It has been the boast of Christianity that it has done more for woman than any institution of man ever contemplated. Not only is this elevation of our sisters seen by contrasting them with the women of antiquity, but the light and shade of the picture is still a palpable reality. To appreciate this we have only to compare pure, virtuous, intellectual, and holy women of Christian lands with those where the light of Gospel civilization has never come, and the contrast is like that of Paradise and Tartarus. What is it that has made this difference? What is it that has made our women but little below the angels, while theirs are but little above the brutes? This elevated refinement of the daughters of Christian civilization is no deception. It is a patent, incontrovertible fact. Could a delusion, a falsehood have effected this mighty revolution? And this amelioration of the gentler sex has a diffusive influence over the whole race. A refined, intellectual, and holy woman brings to her husband the blessings of progressive refinement. She is the competent instructor of her children, an ornament and solace to the society in which she moves, a comfort to the declining years of her aged parents; in short, she is the pride and joy of her father's household.

Now, all this blessedness is too palpable to be overlooked; and, since they see what the Lord has done for them, like the weeping penitent who kissed the feet of Jesus, they love much, because they have received much. One of the most lovely traits of human character outcrops in the sweet devotion of woman's heart to that religion which not only saves her soul from death, but her person from slavery, and has made her a priestess in the Temple of God. And a very efficient minister is she in the blessed work of human redemption. Her unseen, but not unperceived influence—the light of her beaming countenance in the house of God—her earnestness and zeal, uphold, extend, and render permanent the cause of Christ on earth, as no

other influence could. No learning, eloquence, nor official rank of manhood can do for the cause what is constantly and silently done by the sweet influence of maternal and sisterly piety. No priest, bishop, or potentate beneath the skies can do for Christ what the holy love and zeal of pious women are constantly doing.

Knowing all this, these shrewd schemers are setting a plan to work by which they hope to divert the devotion of woman's love from Him who has raised her from Pagan degradation to her present lofty position, and, under the guise of "Woman's Rights," to wean her heart from Him who has done more for her and the race than language is able to express. The impression is sought to be made that the Gospel of Christ is despoiling woman of her rights; or, at least, is leaving her without their distinct recognition. It is importunately urged that something over and above Christianity is going to do more for the sex than the truth, light, and love of Christ have accomplished in their behalf. Let this impression become a general conviction, and its results any ordinary sagacity might easily foresee. The infidels of France could not have accomplished what they did but for the co-operation of intellectual, but ungodly women. For, while it is true that virtuous, holy women have an immense influence for good, it is also true, that the opposite characters have an equal power for evil. Satan has never been so successful in corrupting the human race as when he undertakes to vitiate the faith and affections of woman's heart. It was in this manner he introduced the Primitive Apostasy. The Arch-Deceiver suggested to the woman that there was something in store for her vastly better than God had intended to give. Nay, he had even withheld from her the best means, perhaps the only means, of satisfying the deepest yearnings of her nature, and the strongest bent of her ambition. Thus her confidence in God was weakened, and she was prepared for disobedience; and the flood-gates of sin and misery were opened upon the race. So at this time. Let but the Satanic suggestion prevail, that the Gospel despoils woman of her rights, or leaves them without their distinct recognition, and her faith in, and love for, Christ will be succeeded by harrowing doubts and horrid aversion; and the daughters of the angelic mothers of the *nineteenth* century will become, in the next generation, such gorgons as helped introduce the French Revolution! It is not intended, here, to intimate that *all*, or even a *majority*, of the

advocates of "woman's rights" have any thing but pure motives. Many men and women of large heart and good intentions are engaged in this advocacy. But that the great movers of this progress—they who work the wires—are inimical to Christianity, is too patent to need proof, and that they are shrewd schemers who seek to rob the doctrine of Christ of one great element of popularity, is also too plain for controversy.

But let us here pause to inquire, What are these Women's Rights of which they are so cruelly despoiled by the Gospel of Christ? It is not to be charged upon the Gospel that women receive lower wages for the same quantity and quality of work. On the contrary, if these wrongs are ever redressed, it must be from the influence of a high sense of justice, which naturally inheres to the religion of Christ. No! in this particular there is nothing which involves Christianity; and, hence, it is not displayed with so much eagerness and interest. But the *right of suffrage* is insisted upon as the great RIGHT which includes all others; and this apparently, at least, because God, both as Creator and Redeemer, has put the woman under the authority of the man. "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church." To make woman an elector would be to allow her to rule over man; the very thing for which she is disqualified, both by the delicacy and compliance of her nature, as well as by the decision of her Maker and Redeemer. To invest her with the responsibility of suffrage would but add greatly to the burden of a life already weighed down with onerous obligations. To govern well, implies self-control, deep study, close thought, and great deliberation, besides the thousand and one controversies with which the affairs of public interest are always embroiled. To add these anxieties to the countless vexations of the wife, mother, and housekeeper, would be to give her a heavier burden of care than most *men* are able to carry. Few cares canker more deeply into the human heart than the cares of State. And must we turn these over to her whom, by the laws of God and man, we are bound to protect and honor as the weaker vessel? And for her to vote, without care or reflection, would be doing herself no honor, and no good to the commonwealth.

E. D. Mansfield, one of the ablest editors of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, proposes three questions on this subject, which should be well

pondered by every statesman and Christian. 1. "Will not female suffrage change the proper relations of the family? 2. Will female suffrage be useful to woman? 3. Will female suffrage benefit society as a whole?" As to the first of these questions, the answer must be, It certainly will! If you make woman a ruler in the State, her influence at the polls will be equal to her husband's, and what good reason can be given that she should not assert that authority at home which society has conceded she may wield in matters of the gravest public importance? And two co-ordinate rulers in one house would be like two presidents to one republic, two kings to a kingdom, or two heads to one animal body. Such misshapen republics, kingdoms, and animals are always short-lived; and so would be the institution of the family were all subordination taken away. "Order is heaven's first law;" but order without subordination is an impossibility. If we would have order there must be rulers and the ruled, governors and the governed. It is so in the State, the Church, and the family. And this subordination to legitimate authority is no privation of right, honor, or happiness to any one. The hand finds both honor and pleasure in being subject to the head. But if we could conceive of a hand that would insist upon its right to be the head, and should its ill-advised importunity be granted, it would at once lose both its beauty and utility, and become a frightful monstrosity.

As to the second question, "Will female suffrage be useful to women?" That woman could be any more useful or happy in any sphere other than that assigned her by the authority of Christ, is strongly akin to the logic of the Edenic serpent. God and Christ have put woman under the protection and government of the man; and he is taught to love, respect, and honor her, and in the sanctity of the marriage relation we are taught to consider her identified with her husband. This unity of husband and wife, this great mystery of human society, underlies all virtue, civilization, and religion. Any thing calculated, however remotely, to disturb this oneness of the marriage relation, goes to unsettle the very foundation of all true religion and civilization. And, could women be more useful or happy in a chaotic state of society than in the sweet influence of our present elevated civilization?

But again: all true government rests, for its authority, upon Wisdom and Love. Power is an element of administration, not of

origination. There is no authority in the universe except that which comes from superior wisdom and superior love. *God* governs the world, because he is wiser and loves the world more than his creatures can ever love him. Parents are wiser than their children, and love them more than the children can ever reciprocate; hence, God has put children under the protection and government of parents.

For a similar reason the wife is made subject to her own husband. He loves more, and should be more wise; and his greater physical strength enables him to carry out the administration of his superior wisdom and love.

There are, no doubt, many instances in which the woman is the superior in all these elements of supremacy. But is she the happier for this inferiority of her husband? If she bears rule in such a household, is she happier than she would have been under the administration of a husband of a head and heart superior to her own? The true woman's heart can only be satisfied with the love God has ordained for her; the pure, holy love of an intellect superior to her own. Without this, kingdoms, crowns, and thrones can not make her happy.

If ladies are strong-minded enough to rule over their husbands, it would have been a much better exhibition of such strength had they chosen partners who could have made them happy in the sphere God ordained for them. Where this is not done, no transposition of place or power will ameliorate their condition.

The third question is, "Will women suffrage improve society as a whole?" It is thought, by some, that the superior purity of woman would have a beneficial influence upon politics; but there is much more danger of that purity being tarnished than there is prospect of politics being elevated. It is not improbable that her purity of heart and life may be the effect of her isolation from this ignoble strife. On the question of Temperance she might vote differently from men, but the good that might accrue from such vote would be more than counterbalanced if this new regime is to transpose the details of family government. If its tendencies shall be to make the parties to the marriage contract more independent of each other, assuredly, society at large will experience no improvement; for marriage is the foundation of the social world. Any thing which will consolidate, purify, and elevate its union must have an effect upon society for good; but

whatever tends to disintegrate this unity, or introduce diversity of interests between husband and wife, can not fail to affect the community very disastrously. The more independent of each other the parties become, the less will they feel the restraint of the marriage compact, and the more lightly will they seek its dissolution. I leave it with statisticians to determine whether this be the cause why so many more divorces are now sued for, and obtained, than in former years. Are we beginning already to feel the influence of that scarcely emerging, but baleful star?

We can easily afford to invest our sisters, wives, and mothers with any privilege which will make them more truly happy; but having more faith in God than in the untried theories of men, we feel satisfied, as yet, that the New Testament philosophy of "Woman's Rights" is much better for all concerned than any transposition of things which could be forced upon Christian society. Under the policy of making the husband the head of the wife, society has progressed all the way from barbarism to a point of refinement and civilization which is truly encouraging; and we are still advancing. Now, shall we forfeit all our enjoyment, present and prospective, for the idle hope of outstripping the oracles of God? the hope of being better and happier than God intended?

VIII.—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

HAVING, in former articles, shown the usage of the word ἐπίσκοπος (*episcopos*) in the Scriptures, I now call attention to what is called "Apostolic Succession." And, first, let it be observed that neither the word "Apostolic" nor "succession" are to be found in either the Greek New Testament, or the Common Version. Nor are the *equivalents* of these words to be found in either of these volumes. This being true, the *doctrine* can not be a Scriptural doctrine.

Webster says that "*Apostolical Succession*, in theology, is the regular and uninterrupted transmission of ministerial authority, by a succession of Bishops, from the Apostles to any subsequent period." The first thing required by this definition is "bishops." There is no word in the Greek Testament which means what the word "bishop" means, as used by those who advocate the doctrine of "Episcopacy," as contradistinguished from Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. There is not only no such word, but there is no allusion to such an officer.

There can be no legal succession in any case where the law makes no provision for succession. The laws of Jesus have made no provision for Episcopal succession, and, therefore, there is no such succession in the kingdom of Christ. The claims of Papacy and Episcopacy to Apostolical succession are without the least foundation in the Word of God.

Had Jesus said to Peter, "I give to thee," and to thy successors in office forever, "the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," ample provision would have been made for succession. But, inasmuch as the phrase *and to thy successors in office* is not found in connection with Peter, or any other Apostle, they can have no official successors.

Had this provision been made relative to overseers, or bishops, then there would have been a foundation laid for Episcopal succession; not, however, in the technical sense of that phrase, for every body knows that there never was an "Episcopal Church" in that sense, until the time of Henry VIII, of England. This monarch, after having written a defense of Popery against Martin Luther, and

after having received the title of "Defender of the Faith" from the Pope for that service, caused a new Church to be organized, and placed himself at its head, because the Pope would not divorce him from his wife.

It is the consummation of ecclesiastical arrogance for that Church in England, or for its representative in the United States, to claim Apostolical succession. That claim is at war with all the facts of history which relate to the origin of that Church. The refusal of the clergy of that organization to allow the ministers of other denominations to preach in their churches, on the ground that theirs is the Apostolical Church, and that their ministry is the Apostolical Ministry, while all other Churches and ministers are spurious, is a compound of false assumption, spiritual pride, and religious bigotry, alike unworthy of the spirit and intelligence of our age and country. It is a ground of real satisfaction that there are many men like Dr. Tyng in that Church, who dare to act like Christian gentlemen, and to rise above the Phariseeism and the Ritualism which has characterized Episcopacy so long.

The Church of Christ was governed, in the Apostles' times, by Elders or (ἐπίσκοποι) *Overseers* in the congregations, and by Evangelists, who had the charge of the general interests of all the churches within certain districts. They had no Bishops, no Archbishops, no Deans, no Prebendaries, no Canons, except the laws of God, and no Ritualism. The public services of Christians sprang up spontaneously in the heart, and were modified by surrounding circumstances. The prejudices and lifeless forms of by-gone ages are passing away, and better times are approaching. Let us rejoice and be glad.

The second requisition of Webster's definition of "Apostolical Succession" is the transmission of ministerial authority. "Transmission" implies that this authority is conferred by one officer or person on another. He farther says that it must be an "uninterrupted" transmission; that is, an unbroken transmission. Not a link must be wanting.

This transmission must be "by a succession of bishops from the Apostles to any subsequent period." Now, the oldest Episcopal Church in existence was not organized till about fourteen hundred years after the death of the last surviving Apostle. That Church is the English Episcopal Church. How can a Church, the origin of

which is known to be fourteen hundred years after the Apostolic age, claim an uninterrupted succession of Bishops from the Apostles down to this day? The thing is absurd. It will not do for that Church to attempt to trace their Apostolic succession up through the Roman Catholic Church. The Catholic Bishop or Bishops, who left that Church to form a new one, were deposed and excommunicated by the very authority which made them bishops. The Episcopal Bishops and the Catholic Bishops are two distinct orders of men, and if the Catholics could trace their bishops in uninterrupted succession back to the Apostles, it would avail the English Church nothing. The English Church is not the Catholic Church, nor are the English Bishops Catholic Bishops. As well may those who came out of the English Church claim Apostolic succession through that Church, as that Church to make that claim through the Catholic. By following this principle out we will have Apostolic Succession in abundance.

The disgraceful origin of the English Church ought forever to humble its pride, and put a final period to all its arrogant assumptions.

The man who established that Church "was an unprincipled and cruel tyrant, and the chief business of his life seemed to be selecting and marrying new queens; making room for each succeeding one by discarding, divorcing, or beheading her predecessor. There were six of them in all, and, with one exception, the history of each one is a distinct and separate, but dreadful tragedy." Such was the man who established the English Church. How unlike an Apostle! With how little reason does such a Church claim for itself, or its Bishops, Apostolic Succession!

We are not blaming the Episcopalians of our time for the ignominious origin of their Church, but we are stating facts which they ought to know, and which ought to induce them to leave the organization, and to find a home in a communion, the origin of which is not covered with shame to Christianity, and even to humanity. Let the English aristocracy, who are, and have been, supported by it, support it in turn. But no American should have any connection with it, or any of its offspring.

That Church is the most Apostolical which comes nearest to the Churches founded by the Apostles in its teaching and worship. Just so far as that teaching and worship are departed from, just so far is a Church from being Apostolic.

Judas Iscariot was the only man, of all the Apostles, who can be said to have had a successor. He betrayed his Savior for money, and hanged himself in hopeless despair. He was one of the original "twelve Apostles" who were appointed as witnesses of Christ's resurrection. Twelve witnesses of this great fact being thought necessary, Peter said, (Acts i, 21,) "Therefore, of these men, who accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from John's immersion unto the day when he was taken up from us, must one be made a witness with us of his resurrection." A *substitute* as a witness is admissible; but a *successor* as a witness is absurd. No man could be a substitute who had not been personally acquainted with him from the time of his immersion by John, until he was taken up into heaven. Any person who was born after these events could not be even a substitute, much less a successor.

We are not, however, to look for any particular *form* of worship. There is none laid down in the New Testament. Singing and prayer, praising and thanksgiving, and adoration, are all acts of worship when designed as such. The particular *order* in which these acts shall be performed is not prescribed in the Scriptures. Certain things are to be taught, but as to the particular manner or mode of teaching, that is left to the judgment of the teacher. Ritualism is no part of the Christian religion.

If any man is to be considered as a successor of the Apostles, it is that man who teaches what they taught, and practices what they enjoined.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

1.—*Chips from a German Workshop. By* MAX MÜLLER, *M. A., Fellow of All-Soul's College, Oxford.* In 2 vols. Containing Essays on the Science of Religion, Mythology, Traditions, and Customs. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 372–407. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

IT is simply certain that these volumes will stimulate earnest inquiry upon the subjects of which they treat. Their author is a laborious and enthusiastic student of the languages, and it was natural enough for him, while tracing language back to its origin, to find himself constantly in direct contact with the progress of the religions of the world. For several years Mr. Müller has been engaged in the publication of the "Vedas; or, the Sacred Books of the Brahmans," four volumes of which have already appeared, and the remaining volumes are now passing through the press. It was in reference to this great work that Baron Bunsen suggested to Müller the title of the present volumes. Bunsen spent many days in explaining to the East India Company the importance of publishing Müller's edition of the text and Commentary on the sacred hymns of the Brahmans, and was, at last, successful; and while announcing to Müller the result of his labors, he said to him: "Now you have got a work for life—a large block that will take years to plane and polish; but, mind, let us have, from time to time, some chips from your workshop." The volumes before us are the first installments in answer to Bunsen's request.

These "Chips" from Müller's workshop will, doubtless, slap in the face many religious prejudices of the present day; and, while they will sometimes wound the principles of true religion, it is, nevertheless, quite certain that they will do a work that needs to be done. Religious dogmatism can no longer frown down the free investigation of every question that belongs to the history of man.

Mr. Müller was educated in Germany, but has learned to write in England. In his habits of thought he has the honest freedom of a true German, while his English training has enabled him to express himself in a very perspicuous style; a style, however, characterized by a rigid self-denial of

embellishments. These facts will commend his works to American readers, but will not save him from severe handling by many who will question their tendency.

We will now endeavor to give to our readers what Mr. Müller understands by the Science of Religion. He says:

"During the last fifty years the accumulation of new and authentic materials for the study of the religions of the world has been most extraordinary; but such are the difficulties in mastering these materials, that I doubt whether the time has yet come for attempting to trace, after the model of the Science of Language, the definite outlines of the Science of Religion. By a succession of the most fortunate circumstances the canonical books of three of the principal religions of the ancient world have lately been recovered—the Veda, the Zend-Avesta, and the Tripitaka. But not only have we thus gained access to the most authentic documents from which to study the ancient religion of the Brahmans, the Zoroastrians, and the Buddhists, but, by discovering the real origin of Greek, Roman, and, likewise, of Teutonic, Sclavonic, and Celtic mythology, it has become possible to separate the truly religious elements in the sacred traditions of these nations from the mythological crust by which they are surrounded, and thus to gain a clearer insight into the real faith of the ancient Aryan world."

It will be seen, from this extract, that he approaches the subject modestly, and with many misgivings as to the possibility of reaching, at present, just and satisfactory conclusions. He is, however, a brave and earnest thinker, and is not to be driven from the field of inquiry.because there are difficulties to encounter. He frankly states these difficulties, and then as frankly states some of the advantages which a comparative study of religions will bring to the world. These advantages are declared to be, in substance, as follows:

1. If there is any agreement between the doctrines of the old religions and our own, it will benefit us to know it; if not, then to compare them, and learn how they differ, will help not a little toward confirming that which is the better of the two.

2. "The Science of Religion will, for the first time, assign to Christianity its right place among the religions of the world; it will show, for the first time, fully what was meant by 'the fullness of time;' it will restore to the whole history of the world, in its unconscious progress toward Christianity, its true and sacred character."

3. It will be of the greatest assistance to missionaries. "Missionaries are apt to look upon all other religions as something totally distinct from their own, as formerly they used to describe the languages of barbarous nations as something more like the twittering of birds than the articulate speech of men. The Science of Language has taught us that there is order and wisdom in all languages, and even the most degraded jargons contain the ruins of former greatness and beauty. The Science of Religion, I hope, will produce a similar change in our views of barbarous forms of faith and worship, and missionaries, instead of looking only for points of difference, will look out more anxiously for any common ground, any spark of the true

light that may still be revived, any altar that may be dedicated afresh to the true God."

4. "And, even to us at home, a wider view of the religious life of the world may teach many a useful lesson."

These and subsidiary matters are discussed in a manner peculiar to the distinguished author. It is the basis of Müller's creed that "what they [men] contemptuously call 'natural religion' is, in reality, the greatest gift that God has bestowed on the children of man; and without it revealed religion itself would have no firm foundation, no living roots in the heart of man." He holds that

"Every religion, even the most imperfect and degraded, has something that ought to be sacred to us, for there is in all religions a secret yearning after the true, though unknown God. Whether we see the Papua squatting in dumb meditation before his fetich, or whether we listen to Firdusi exclaiming: 'The height and the depth of the whole world have their center in Thee, O my God! I do not know thee what thou art; but I know that thou art what thou alone canst be;' we ought to feel that the place whereon we stand is holy ground."

Mr. Müller shows an intimate acquaintance with the various themes he has selected for discussion, and it may be safely affirmed that his chapter on "Comparative Mythology" is the ablest treatise upon that subject in any language. But the first volume, which discusses the Science of Religion, is of far greater interest than the second, which treats of Mythology, Traditions, and Customs. The great work upon which Mr. Müller has been engaged for so long a time, namely: the publication of the Veda, has brought his mind into contact with a religious history heretofore unknown to the Christian world. Under many embarrassing circumstances, he has pressed forward with his work until the last volumes have been placed in the hands of the printer. Surely, for such a contribution to the religious literature of our times, the author should receive the earnest thanks of all scholars. We hope, in some subsequent number of the QUARTERLY, to give a more detailed account of his labors, as well as a juster and fuller notice of his "Chips from a German Workshop." For the present we conclude with the following extract from the Preface of the volumes before us. What is here stated is worthy of the most profound consideration:

"If there is one thing which a comparative study of religions places in the clearest light, it is the inevitable decay to which every religion is exposed. It may seem almost like a truism that no religion can continue to be what it was during the lifetime of its founder and its first apostles. Yet it is but seldom borne in mind that without constant reformation, i. e., without a constant return to its fountain-head, every religion, even the most perfect, nay, the most perfect on account of its very perfection, more even than others, suffers from its contact with the world, as the purest air suffers from the mere fact of its being breathed.

"Whenever we can trace back a religion to its first beginnings, we find it free from many of the blemishes that offend us in its later phases. The founders of the ancient religions of

the world, as far as we can judge, were men of a high stamp, full of noble aspirations, yearning for truth, devoted to the welfare of their neighbors, examples of purity and unselfishness. What they desired to found upon earth was but seldom realized, and their sayings, if preserved in their original form, offer often a strange contrast to the practice of those who profess to be their disciples. As soon as a religion is established, and more particularly when it has become the religion of a powerful state, the foreign and worldly elements encroach more and more on the original foundation, and human interests mar the simplicity and purity of the plan which the founder had conceived in his own heart, and matured in his communings with his God. Even those who lived with Buddha misunderstood his words, and, at the Great Council which had to settle the Buddhist canon, Asoka, the Indian Constantine, had to remind the assembled priests that 'what had been said by Buddha, that alone was well said,' and that certain works ascribed to Buddha, as, for instance, the instruction given to his son, Râhula, were apocryphal, if not heretical. With every century, Buddhism, when it was accepted by nations differing as widely as Mongols and Hindus, when its sacred writings were translated into languages as wide apart as Sanskrit and Chinese, assumed widely different aspects, till, at last, the Buddhism of the Shamans, in the steppes of Tartary, is as different from the teaching of the original Samana, as the Christianity of the leader of the Chinese rebels is from the teaching of Christ. If missionaries could show to the Brahmans, the Buddhists, the Zoroastrians, nay, even to the Mohammedans how much their present faith differs from the faith of their forefathers and founders, if they could place in their hands and read with them, in a kindly spirit, the original documents on which these various religions profess to be founded, and enable them to distinguish between the doctrines of their own sacred books and the additions of later ages, an important advantage would be gained, and the choice between Christ and other masters would be rendered far more easy to many a truth-seeking soul. But for that purpose it is necessary that we, too, should see the beam in our own eyes, and learn to distinguish between the Christianity of the nineteenth century and the religion of Christ. If we find that the Christianity of the nineteenth century does not win as many hearts in India and China as it ought, let us remember that it was the Christianity of the first century, in all its dogmatic simplicity, but with its overpowering love of God and man, that conquered the world, and superseded religions and philosophies more difficult to conquer than the religious and philosophical systems of Hindus and Buddhists. If we can teach something to the Brahmans in reading with them their sacred hymns, they, too, can teach us something when reading with us the Gospel of Christ. Never shall I forget the deep despondency of a Hindu convert, a real martyr to his faith, who had pictured to himself, from the pages of the New Testament, what a Christian country must be, and who, when he came to Europe, found every thing so different from what he had imagined in his lonely meditations at Benares! It was the Bible only that saved him from returning to his old religion, and helped him to discern, beneath theological futilities accumulated during nearly two thousand years, beneath pharisaical hypocrisy, infidelity, and want of charity, the buried but still living seed committed to the earth by Christ and his Apostles. How can a missionary, in such circumstances, meet the surprise and questions of his pupils unless he may point to that seed and tell them what Christianity was meant to be; unless he may show that, like all other religions, Christianity, too, has had its history; that the Christianity of the nineteenth century is not the Christianity of the Middle Ages; that the Christianity of the Middle Ages was not that of the early councils; that the Christianity of the early councils was not that of the Apostles, and 'that what has been said by Christ, that alone was well said?'

"The advantages, however, which missionaries and other defenders of the faith will gain from a comparative study of religions, though important hereafter, are not, at present, the chief object of these researches. In order to maintain their scientific character they must be independent of all extraneous considerations; they must aim at truth, trusting that even unpalatable truths, like unpalatable medicine, will reinvigorate the system into which they enter. To those, no doubt, who value the tenets of their religion as the miser values his pearls and precious stones; thinking their value lessened if pearls and stones of the same

kind are found in other parts of the world, the Science of Religion will bring many a rude shock; but to the true believer truth, wherever it appears, is welcome, nor will any doctrine seem the less true or the less precious because it was seen, not only by Moses or Christ, but, likewise, by Buddha or Lao-tse. Nor should it be forgotten that while a comparison of ancient religions will certainly show that some of the most vital articles of faith are the common property of the whole of mankind, at least of all who seek the Lord, if, haply, they might feel after him, and find him, the same comparison alone can possibly teach us what is peculiar to Christianity, and what has secured to it that pre-eminent position which now it holds in spite of all obloquy. The gain will be greater than the loss, if loss there be, which I, at least, shall never admit."

2.—*Poems, by* Lucy Larcom. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. 275. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

It has been said that the mechanical spirit of the age, especially in our New World, is quite inimical to poetry, and that, in seeking to utilize every element of power, whether mental or physical, we encourage the practical to the exclusion of the ideal. To some extent this is true. But whatever society may do in furtherance of its own material plans of improvement or progress, the individual is certainly left free to follow the promptings of his own peculiar genius, and if a poet by nature (*poeta nascitur non fit*) he can, at pleasure, choose the flowery paths of ideal beauty, or soar aloft amid "cloud-capped realms of thought and fancy" in fond pursuit of his favorite muse, peopling his celestial paradise with beings of diviner mold than common clay.

The special aim of modern poets seems directed to the external embodiment of sentiment and feeling as expressed in smooth and faultless versification, melodious rhythm, flowing, easy, and graceful periods, musical as murmuring waters, and soothing as a lullaby. Instead of exalting our weary, world-worn spirits to the sublime heights of ideal contemplation, we feel limited to the actual and commonplace around us, our richest treasures of thought and feeling undeveloped, our longings for the infinite unsatisfied, and our emotional nature untouched, save by shallow appeals to our sympathy in sickly repetitions of worn-out phrases, personal complainings of life, that to some has proved a failure, all too faintly expressive of those higher and nobler impulses and aspirations which characterize every true and earnest heart. A poet should be the soul's interpreter, kindling anew its enthusiasm, and inspiring it to lofty endeavor. Not content with portraying material objects alone, or bringing before us, in panoramic beauty and grandeur, the glories of sea, earth, and sky, he should seek to fathom the more subtile domain of spiritual life, so fraught with deep and mysterious experiences, and, by a ready sympathy with every varied feeling of the human heart, endeavor to breathe words of solace and cheer to the despairing soul, quicken its half-formed purposes for good, awaken into new life its

dormant energies, and irradiate its gloom with visions of the coming dawn. We do not think our New World deficient in those elements which constitute genuine poetry, although its ceaseless activities and constant changes may, at times, prove somewhat detrimental to that seclusion and study so necessary to the poet.

It is unfortunate for American literature, as well as for the fame of our authors, that so many writers "rush into print" almost before their ink is dry. Especially is it to be regretted that young persons, devoid of experience or mental culture, with only sufficient knowledge as will enable them to distinguish between lyric, dramatic, pastoral, or heroic verse, should force their crude thoughts (too often plagiarisms, better expressed in their original prose) upon a generous public, whose anxiety to encourage literary merit often does positive injury to the future fame of a young author thus suddenly brought into notice. If we should point these youthful aspirants to a past age, and quote the saying of an eminent English writer, that "No poem should be published in less than thirty years after its first composition," thus giving its author ample time to perfect it in all its parts, as a sculptor would finish the *chef-d'œuvre* that was to immortalize his name, they would tell us that *American* genius, fostered under new institutions, was of more rapid growth, requiring no such delay in order to mature its work. How unfortunate for ancient authors that they did not live in our day, thus avoiding the tedium of laborious study and research! What would modern writers think of such literary toil as was endured by Virgil, Pliny, Aristotle, Seneca, Fenelon, Rousseau, and Buffon? It is said of the former, that he was so dissatisfied with the "Æneid" that he ordered it to be burned, and that out of every thirty verses which he wrote in the morning scarcely ten were left at night. Fenelon corrected "Telemachus" seven times before allowing it to be published; and Rousseau copied several of his works five times, some of his sentences costing him four or five nights' study. Pliny the elder read over two thousand volumes before completing his "Natural History," and Buffon studied his great work entitled "Epoques de la Nature" for fifty years, copying it eighteen times before giving it to the public. He would sometimes rewrite a sentence twenty times, and was once fourteen hours in finding the proper word for turning a period. Our modern economists will say all this was a great waste of time and talent. Perhaps so; but these illustrious names will go down to posterity, and be remembered by generations yet unborn, while the fame of our more ambitious writers of to-day will scarcely survive the present century.

Having said this much in regard to authors in general, we now come to the examination of the poetical volume whose title is at the head of this notice. We wish we could say that the work before us formed an exception to others of its class; but here, as elsewhere, we discover the absence of

originality of thought or depth of feeling, while hasty and imperfect sketches of life, character, scenery, etc., fill up the volume from beginning to end, with only here and there a thought or fanciful conception that could in any way be mistaken for an inspiration. We read several of these effusions before they were collected into a volume, and admired their naturalness, simplicity of expression, and harmonious rhythm; but, like most of our newspaper poetry, they scarcely bear a re-reading, especially in book form, where their monotony is the more apparent, like so many beads of similar size and shape strung along upon the same silken cord with but little variation or design.

3.—*By-Ways of Europe. By* BAYARD TAYLOR. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 12mo. pp. 470. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

WHILE the question of international copyright is up for discussion, we respectfully suggest that there are other things that need regulation by wholesome laws. And, when the copyright question is settled, it may be as well to settle these other things at the same time. Surely, there should be a stringent law passed against the publication of stupid books of travel; for there is no literature so utterly worthless as this kind. And yet the country is flooded with books of travel whose only recommendation is the fidelity with which they follow the descriptions of places that have already been described a thousand and one times.

Every "Rev. Mr. Sourball" who is fortunate enough to get sick, and, as a consequence, is fortunate enough to obtain leave of absence from his congregation for a few months' European tour; or, every dry goods clerk or "sentimental idler" who has money enough to spend a few months abroad, must cross the ocean, rush over the highways of travel, and then as rapidly rush into print, to give us the inevitable reproduction of the guide-books in endless platitudes and unbearable stupidities.

But Bayard Taylor does not belong to this class of travelers, and his books, as a general rule, do not belong to the dull class. During the past twenty-two years he has written and published ten volumes of travel, all of which have been eagerly sought by the reading public, and many of which are yet in demand; and it would have been well for Mr. Taylor had he stopped with those volumes, for we do not think that "By-Ways of Europe" will add any thing to his reputation. Not that the book is devoid of interest, but because it cultivates a field which, though for the most part out of the ordinary course of travel, has little or no interest in it for the general reader. And then the style is scarcely up to Mr. Taylor's usual vein. He seems to have very little interest himself in the places described; hence, the book has the appearance of having been made up of the odds and ends of what has been left out in other volumes—a sort of *disjecta membra* of many

years of travel. But one thing, however, will commend this volume, as it does all of Mr. Taylor's works; it is simply a record of facts and experiences, and is not burdened with crude philosophical reflections upon half-perceived, and still less understood, meaning of things. Mr. Taylor is always deliberate, speaks only what he knows, is cautious in his generalizations, and is remarkably candid in his conclusions. Hence, while the general reader will not be particularly attracted by his present volume, for the reasons already intimated, it is also true that a very large number of people will find in it the very things they want, and will welcome it as a valuable contribution to a class of literature that could no longer be kept respectable if such men as Mr. Taylor were to stop writing.

4.—*The New West; or, California in* 1867–68. *By* CHARLES LORING BRACE. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. London: N. Trübner & Co. 12mo. pp. 373. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THIS is not only an interesting book, but a really valuable one. Just now, when, by means of the Pacific Railroad, California is brought so near to us, a work upon that country, from the hands of so competent an author as Mr. Brace, will be heartily welcomed by American readers. The style of the book is admirable, full of energy and lively interest, while the facts presented can not fail to be of service to those who may wish to become familiar with that great and growing country on our Pacific coast. Much of the matter is entirely new to most Americans, and can not fail to awaken a deep interest in that land which has heretofore been mainly *terra incognita* to a large majority of the people on this side of the Rocky Mountains. The following, concerning the city of San Francisco, furnishes our more Eastern cities with some facts for serious consideration:

"The more I examine the Californian Capital, the more I am struck with its aspect as a city where democracy has succeeded. Universal suffrage has had here its legitimate effects; it has given the government of affairs to the intelligent and moral classes, and those with most material interests. This may have arisen from the influence of large numbers of educated and energetic young Americans who early emigrated here, or it may be an effect of that tremendous outburst of moral power which overrode all the bounds of law and order, and put the elements of rascality and devilishness under foot for a generation to come—the revolution under the Vigilance Committee, thirteen years since. However it be explained, it is certain that the city is much better governed than any of our eastern cities. The police is good; the citizen is safe in the lowest streets; fires are less frequent and destructive than with us, though the houses are of the most combustible nature; there is little open and repulsive vice; gambling is held in with a tight rein; the streets are dirty, it is true, but cleaner than those of New York; the schools (of which I shall speak more hereafter) and the school system, are the best; the Sunday is better observed than in New York. It is evident that the intelligent and moral element has the control, and keeps it vigorously. And all these results, be it remembered, have been obtained, not from the State, as with us, but by universal suffrage in the city. Of course, there is jobbery here, as elsewhere, and the low and immoral elements get a voice sometimes, but, on the whole, the city seems well governed."

5.—*Tablets. By* A. Bronson Alcott. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 12mo. pp. 208. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

As its name indicates, this volume is a transcript of thoughts upon various topics, written during hours of calm reflection, instead of a complete treatise upon any one subject. Mr. Alcott has been long and favorably known as a philosopher, his early life having been devoted to the cause of education, especially of youth, while his later years have been given to study and philosophical research. He has been styled the "Peripatetic Philosopher," owing to his "Conversations," both public and private, in cities and villages where he has been invited to discourse, upon "Divinity," "Human Nature," "Ethics," and "Dietetics," including, also, a wide range of practical questions. He is a scholar of no ordinary attainments, possessing an original mind, with fine perception of the great principles of life in their relation to morals. Under the head of "Practical," Mr. Alcott gives us brief essays upon "The Garden," "Recreation," "Friendship," "Culture," "Counsels," and "Books;" while in the second division of his work, entitled "Speculative," he discourses upon "Instrumentalities," "Mind," "Genesis," and "Metamorphoses." In this department of his work his style is often transcendental, differing materially from that of modern essayists, and resembling more the writings of Plato, Seneca, Montaigne, and Coleridge. Like Emerson, he is almost too much of an idealist to be popular with the masses; and to the casual reader, full of sympathy and enthusiasm, his present work will seem dull and prosaic. His method of treating a subject is purely didactic, instead of rhetorical, and though he makes no display of learning or logic, he shows himself a perfect master of the English language, using it as the vehicle of thought rather than of ornament. Mr. Alcott was born at the close of the last century, in Wolcott, Conn., and being the son of a farmer, and unable to obtain an education, at that time, suited to his intellectual tastes, he early applied himself to study, depending on his own resources, and may be considered, like many other eminent New England scholars and authors, a "self-made man." He has published but two works, and those, with the exception of his last, appeared many years ago, one of them being entitled "Record of a School," the other, "Conversations on the Gospels." Most of the philosophic works that have emanated from New England during the past twenty-five years have been revised by him, and he is also the author of numerous magazine articles. His devotion to the cause of education, and his peculiar method of instruction, attracted the attention of celebrated educators across the Atlantic, and in 1842 he was invited to visit England, where he was cordially received by his friends, who had already given his name to their school at "Alcott House," near London. He remained abroad several months, and, on his return, removed to Boston.

6.—*Reminiscences of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. A Social and Artistic Biography. By* ELISE POLKO. *Translated from the German by Lady Wallace, with Additional Letters addressed to English Correspondents.* New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 16mo. pp. 334. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

IN this volume we are first introduced to the great musician when he is fifteen years of age. We catch a glimpse of him as he appeared at that time to "Old Zelter," who wrote to Goëthe concerning the youthful prodigy. From that time we are gracefully carried along with the development of Mendelssohn into mature manhood. During this period we are often in company with such masters as Moscheles, Hummel, Berger, Klein, Paganini, etc., while the home of Mendelssohn is frequently visited by such notables as Humboldt and Goëthe. At last, when his success is fully assured, we willingly join the rapturous applause which greeted him at London, Paris, Düsseldorf, Leipsic, Frankfort-on-the-Main, and Berlin. At all these places he won immortal fame. We are told that the "enthusiasm is indescribable with which 'St. Paul,' even before it was completed, was received and studied in its separate parts, by the Düsseldorf circles. When Mendelssohn caused any of the choruses to be rehearsed, listeners assembled in crowds, and often burst forth into loud shouts of applause."

Madame Polko's reminiscences of Mendelssohn will be hailed with pleasure in this country, where the works of the great composer are so highly appreciated. The Madame evidently writes with a warm interest in her subject, and may sometimes seem to be rather too partial in her delineations; nevertheless, we are truly thankful for her not only interesting, but highly valuable, work. The book contains, in an appendix, several unpublished letters of Mendelssohn, which will be an invaluable treasure to those who are already acquainted with his charming style.

Few men have ever lived who had all the qualities of head and heart necessary to a truly cultivated gentleman more fully developed, and more beautifully blended in their proper proportions, than had the author of "Elijah." His compositions form a class in themselves. In delicate sweetness, in refined and graceful movement, he is scarcely ever equaled, and never surpassed; while the surprises of enthusiasm which are every now and then breaking in upon his quiet thoughts make up a marked feature of his works, and give a charming variety to all his compositions. The following remark of Hildebrandt gives us the key to his whole character: "We often marveled at all the wisdom in this young head. We constantly felt how immeasurably he was above us, and yet, at other times, he was as full of boyish mirth and high spirits as the youngest among us." His influence upon his friends was of the most positive character, hence we do not wonder at the enthusiasm which marks Madame Polko's "Reminiscences."

7.—*Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms, by* ALBERT BARNES. In Three Volumes. Vols. ii, iii. New York: Harper & Brothers. 16mo. pp. 383–343. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

A HURRIED glance, as it must needs be, for the present, through these volumes is enough to show that the author fully sustains the reputation for candid investigation, wide and wise scholarship, Christian charity, and pious devotion, which he so distinctly won in his former labors, and which have been so justly and thoroughly awarded him by the grateful Christian world.

Pausing, here and there, in this hurried glance to rest upon some well-known and sweet Psalm, we have been refreshed by the music of it as rendered by this skillful and absorbed interpreter of the hidden beauty and grace of the strain. We had noted a few of these Psalms for reference in this notice; but to mention them would be an almost irresistible temptation to make extracts from the notes and comments, which would lengthen our notice beyond reasonable bounds. The thousands who will read these volumes, in the study, and in the family, and in the Sunday School, will have the whole mine of devotional and explanatory wealth to explore at their leisure. While we thus speak, candor compels us to say, also, that we do not think that Mr. Barnes's type of mind and habits of thought so well adapted to interpreting the poetry of the Bible as its prose. Hence, we do not think these volumes equal to most of his other works.

With these volumes Albert Barnes closes his labors of Commentary upon the Christian Scriptures. For forty years has his toil in this special field been prosecuted, and the Christian world has cordially welcomed and honored his work. In the ripeness of his years, and amid the rich harvestings of his sowing, he now awaits the messenger-angel whose hand shall lead him and whose wing shall bear him to that unspeakable reward of ever-growing blessing, which is the final and eternal inheritance of all the faithful laborers of God. And if every servant of Christ and of the Church, reaching the years of Albert Barnes, could look back upon a life so constantly and so well spent as his, how joyous would be the hour of departure from the field, and what treasures of blessings would be left behind for the generations to come after!

In closing his work, Mr. Barnes says:

"Here I close my exposition of this book, and with it all that I purpose or expect to prepare in attempting to furnish a Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. The volumes which I have prepared have occupied me daily, almost without intermission, for nearly forty years of my life; and now, at sixty-eight years of age, and with the diminished power of vision with which it has pleased God to afflict me, I can hope to attempt no more. More than a generation has passed away while I have been engaged in these labors; and the finishing of this work, and the reason why I can not hope to do more, admonish me that I am soon to follow that generation to the grave, and that all my work must soon be ended. . . I can not close this work without emotion. I can not lay down my pen at the end of this long task without the feeling that with me the work of life is nearly over. Yet, I could close

it at no better place than in finishing the exposition of this book; and the language with which the Book of Psalms itself closes, seems to me to be eminently appropriate to all that I have experienced. All that is past—all in the prospect of what is to come—call for a long, a joyful, a triumphant HALLELUJAH!"

8.—*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. By the* REV. W. J. CONYBEARE, M. A., *Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the* REV. J. S. HOWSON, M. A., *Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool.* Two vols. in one. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo. pp. 1015. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

PERHAPS no contribution to religious literature, in modern times, has been received with more general favor than this work. It has now been nearly twenty years since it was first issued from the London press, and the demand for it is as great now as at any time since its first appearance. Such permanent popularity must have a solid basis on which to rest, and such, we are convinced, is the fact.

The plan of the work is happily conceived, and its execution is above all praise. No other work has ever given to us such a vivid picture of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. The vast amount of information concerning the coasts, islands, etc., of the Eastern Mediterranean, collected from time to time by detachments of the English navy, has been laid under contribution, and happily used in throwing every possible light upon the life and Epistles of St. Paul. Every available matter, whether gleaned from travel, surveys, or official reports, has been made to bear a part in introducing us more intimately to the Apostle's life and labors. Hence, the volume soon enables us to become acquainted with the *man* Paul. We are made traveling companions with him in his missionary journeys; we have a place among his hearers when he preaches to the people; and, in fact, share with him all his joys and sorrows throughout his trying, though splendid, ministry. In short, the work is just what was needed to give us a proper view of one of the most splendid characters the world has ever seen; and, as such, it should have a place in every well-selected religious library.

9.—*The Land and its Story; or, the Sacred Historical Geography of Palestine. By* N. C. BURT, D. D., author of "The Far East," "Hours among the Gospels," etc. Illustrated. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 4to. pp. 381. 1869.

A GOOD and reliable historical geography of Palestine has been much needed. Most of the works on that subject are either somewhat out of date, or else very incomplete and unsatisfactory. And yet, no country in the world, in its geography and history, is of such great interest as the sacred

land of Palestine. Dr. Burt, in the volume before us, has made a valuable contribution to the geographical and historical literature of that country. The plan of his work is simple. After four lectures, of a general and preparatory character, in company with the reader, he makes the tour of Palestine, "going from south to north; stopping upon each important geographical locality; observing what is of present interest, and gathering up, and exhibiting, in the light of the actual scene, its Scripture associations. In thus traversing the land from south to north the development of the geography coincides with the general flow of the history; the south country coming into prominence early in the Old Testament narrative, the central country rising into chief importance later in that narrative, while the northern country, or Galilee, finds its great and lasting significance in New Testament times, in connection with Gospel history."

The work shows considerable painstaking, a very correct understanding of the subject, and is every-where marked with a spirit of frankness and reverence for the Christian religion, which can not fail to commend it to Christian readers. The style is simple, but quite perspicuous, and, though too tame to interest the general reader, is well enough adapted to the plan of the work.

10.—*Night Scenes in the Bible. By* Rev. Daniel March, D. D., author of "Walks and Homes of Jesus." Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis: Zeigler, M'Curdy & Co. 8vo. pp. 544. 1868.

This volume belongs to a class of works that are generally failures. Any effort to intensify the interest in Bible scenes, by treating them in human language, must be made at great hazard. The Bible is a perfect book, not only in the fullness and character of its teachings, but also in the style in which it is written. It contains the finest poetry, and the finest specimens of prose composition, that can be found in any language; hence, it is a most difficult thing to improve on what is found in that blessed book. We make new classifications, (for many of those in the Bible are arbitrary,) but there is little else we can undertake with safety.

With this view deeply impressed upon our mind, it was with many doubts that we opened Dr. March's volume. It had an inviting look from the outside, but we could not hope for corresponding matter within. But we are now prepared to say we were agreeably disappointed. Instead of the platitudes and overstrained metaphors which usually characterize works of this class, it abounds in rich practical observations, natural and graceful descriptions, chaste and elegant diction, while, here and there, throughout the entire work, are found some of the most eloquent passages in the English language.

11.—*Debate on Baptism and Kindred Subjects, between* ELDER JAMES M. MATHES, *of the Church of Christ, and* REV. T. S. BROOKS, *of the M. E. Church. Held in the Town Hall in Bedford, Ind., continuing six days, from January* 28, 1868, *to February* 3, *inclusive. By* ELDER JAMES M. MATHES. Cincinnati: H. S. Bosworth. 12mo. pp. 321. 1868.

THIS debate is between a courteous Christian gentleman and a coarse, dogmatic sectarian. It discusses the difference between New Testament Christianity and the religion of human creeds. Those who are curious to understand this difference, both in letter and spirit, will find much of what they want in this book.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

12.—*Galilée, les droits de la science et la méthode des sciences physiques par* TH. HENRI MARTN. (Galileo: The Rights of Science and the Method of the Physical Sciences, by TH. HENRI MARTIN.) Paris: 1868. 8vo. pp. viii, 428.

Galilée, son procès, sa condemnation d'après des documents inédits par HENRI DE L'EPINOIS. (Galileo; his Trial and Condemnation, according to Inedited Documents, by HENRI DE L'EPINOIS.) Paris: 1867. 8vo. pp. 108.

Galilée, sa vie, des découvertes et ses travaux par le DR. MAX. PARCHAPPE. (Galileo; his Life, Discoveries, and Labors, by DR. MAX. PARCHAPPE.) Paris: 1866. 8vo. pp. xv, 401.

THE publication of the first of the above-named works leads us to mention the others in connection therewith. Every one familiar with the life and fortunes of the scientific reformer, Galileo, knows what importance attaches to his trial and condemnation. The question whether or not the venerable philosopher was, on the night of the 21st of June, 1633, put upon the rack, by the fathers of the Holy Inquisition, has, for more than two centuries, been the subject of acrimonious debate. Roman Catholic writers have generally stoutly denied the charge which has been continually preferred by most others. There seemed to be no way of deciding the matter to the final satisfaction of unprejudiced minds. It was strongly suspected that the official reports and documents concerning the trial had been mutilated, and the fact that they were not allowed to be published did not tend to lessen this suspicion. The straightforward way (a way, however, to which "our Catholic brethren" are seldom inclined) would have been to issue an official and complete edition of the documents, and to open the original to the inspection of scholars. This would have given the literary world the means of settling

the question, so far as it can be settled by mere diplomatic investigation. To be sure, persons whose discretion could be trusted had, now and then, been allowed a peep at these documents, but M. de l' Epinois was the first at whose disposal they were placed, and, we suppose, that even he must have been in some manner restricted, for he did not venture to publish them complete. He has, nevertheless, in describing the manuscript, and in the fragments which he publishes, furnished a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. Both he and M. Martin think they have proved conclusively that Galileo was not put to the torture; but whoever reads the chapter which M. Parchappe devotes to this question (pp. 245–260) will, probably, still be unconvinced. The concluding sentence of this chapter will stand in the face of all special pleading from the partisans of the Roman Church: "*La doute de l'histoire est le châtiment mérité du secret de la procédure inquisitoriale obstinément gardé jusqu'à nos jours.*"

For the rest we can heartily recommend all these works to persons interested in the investigation of the relation of the Roman Church to progress in Science and letters. The work of Parchappe is particularly valuable as containing, in an appendix covering 119 pages, a complete digest and analysis, with translations, of the principal passages of Galileo's greatest work, the "Dialogue on the two great Systems of the Universe, the Ptolemaic and the Copernican"—the work which mortally offended Urban VIII and the Church of Rome. M. Martin's book is another elaborate attempt to show that this Church is favorable to the progress of Science. He condemns the condemnation of Galileo in unsparing language, but is, of course, (from his point of view,) bound to prove that this is not, at the same time, a condemnation of the Church. The translation of a few passages will give a clear idea of his style of argument:

"None of the decisions of the Roman Congregations against the new astronomical system were otherwise published than in the name of the Congregations themselves. Now, although, even according to Roman principles these Congregations may demand obedience, and impose punishments, they can not make an article of faith of a proposition which has not previously been uttered as such by an infallible authority; nor can they make it a duty to regard a proposition as heretical which has not previously been condemned as heretical by the Church, or by the Pope speaking in the name of the Church (*ex Cathedra*); therefore Galileo had no need, either before or after his condemnation, nor had any Catholic, either before or after him, any need to feel himself bound to believe in the immobility of the earth, and in the motion of the sun around the earth." (p. 144.) "The Popes Paul V and Urban VIII had scruples in regard to the system of Copernicus and Galileo; they were also personally inclined to regard it as incompatible with the Bible; they caused the Roman Congregations to condemn the system, the

books in which it was defended, and one of its representatives, but they did not mean, *as Popes*, to declare *in the name of the Church* the new system to be heretical and contrary to Scripture; they did not mean to declare this, because they were not firmly convinced of it, or, better, because divine Providence did not permit it. They left the responsibility with the Congregations for their fallible decisions, which had, of course, to be reversed after the proof of the truth of the condemned system had become incontrovertible. *As men*, Paul V and Urban VIII erred with the Roman Congregations, whose decisions they both knew and desired beforehand; but they had no thought of confirming these decisions, and still less of announcing the propositions therein contained to be articles of faith. In one word, in spite of the human weaknesses of these two Popes, the Papacy had remained infallible in the exercise of its dogmatic authority. (!!) . . . Thus in testing the decisions of the Roman Congregations of 1616 and 1633, one does not raise a complaint against *the Church;* there is, therefore, no occasion to defend the Church; and those imprudent persons must be disavowed who compromise the name of the Church by setting up a questionable defense of decrees which did not go out from her, and have since been revoked. We are called upon calmly to judge only the resolutions passed by fallible men, and that under difficult circumstances, which admit of our judging mildly of their motives without justifying their conclusions." (pp. 151, 152.)

This style of reasoning is not new, and needs no further comment. The motto which the author prefixes to his book is: "*Toute la vérité, rien que la vérité*," the whole truth, nothing but the truth; which forcibly reminds us of the saying: "*La vérité ne fait pas autant de bien dans le monde, que ses apparences y font de mal;*" the truth does not produce as much good in the world as the appearances of it do harm.

13.—*Johannes Kepler. Vier Bücher in drei Theilen. Von* Dr. Edmund Reitlinger, *k. k. Professor am Polytechnikum in Wien, unter Mitwirkung von* C. W. Neumann, *und dem Herausgeber*, C. Gruner. *Mit vielen Illustrationen. Erster Theil.* (Johannes Kepler. Four Books in Three Parts. By Dr. Edmund Reitlinger, Royal Professor at the Polytechnical School in Vienna, in co-operation with C. W. Neumann and the Editor, C. Gruner. With many Illustrations. Part First.) Stuttgart: 1868. 8vo. pp. xvi, 224.

Nikolaus Kopernikus und Martin Luther. Nach ermländischen Archivalien, von Dr. Franz Hipler, *Subregens des Klerikalseminars zu Braunsberg.* (Nicholas Copernicus and Martin Luther. From Sources contained in the Archives of Ermeland, by Dr. Franz Hipler, Subregent of the Clerical Seminary at Braunsberg.) Braunsberg: 1868. 8vo. pp. 75.

Copernicus, Luther, Kepler—three names of which Germany has good reason to be proud; for that Copernicus was also of German descent, and

not of Polish, as was commonly supposed, is now probably beyond question. The little work of Dr. Hipler is scarcely what its title would lead one to expect—a comparison of Copernicus and Luther. It is true, he gives us in the introduction, in a few pregnant sentences, a comparison of the character and the reformatory work of these remarkable men. Then, as a *pendant* to his picture of Copernicus, which constitutes the main part of the work, he prints, for the first time, a *judicium de Lutero*, written in 1523, by Johannes Dantiscus, Bishop of Ermeland, who, as embassador of the King of Poland, had visited Luther in Wittenberg. But the publication of the two writings under one cover was, doubtless, dictated more by convenience than by any real relation which they bear to each other. The biographical sketch of Copernicus is, however, really valuable. Those who have hitherto, since Gassendi, written the life of the father of modern astronomy, have been mainly dependent upon him for the facts. The present author has gone back to the sources. The materials contained in the archives at Frauenburg, Königsberg, and Upsala were placed at his disposal, and through them he has shed new light upon many doubtful points in Copernicus's life. We are no longer in doubt upon any important point in the chronology thereof; and we now know much more about the course of his education, and about his position and activity in Frauenburg than we did before. All previously existing biographies of Copernicus will have to be corrected in accordance with the results of Dr. Hipler's researches, and all future ones be governed by them.

The modern theory of the universe, which takes its name from Copernicus, owes its existence quite as much to Kepler. The former made the grand discovery that the sun, and not the earth, is the center of our system, but it remained for the latter to discover the true orbit of the planets, and the laws of their motions. As Kepler was, without doubt, one of the greatest minds, so the tragic story of his life makes him one of the most interesting characters of all ages. His early career was brilliant, and outwardly successful; but misfortune overtook him; he was persecuted, his aged mother accused of witchcraft, and he ended his days in poverty, and without a home. The Thirty Years' War, which robbed him of his livelihood for a long period, also robbed him of his fame. Men carried on a bloody and cruel war for a whole generation about the way to heaven, and he who said, "In heaven we live, in heaven we are, we and all the bodies of the universe," was forgotten, especially in his native land. Germany was laid waste; half its population destroyed; and not only its material prosperity, but also its intellectual culture, was annihilated. Kepler's science emigrated, and found the friends in England and France it could not find at home. Even his manuscripts were destined, at a later period, to pass into the hands of a foreign monarch—Catherine II of Russia. But at length, after the

lapse of more than a century and a half, Kepler's astronomy found, contemporaneous with the new birth of German literature in the latter half of the eighteenth century, worthy apostles in the land of his birth, and, by and by, men began to remember, with honor, his long-neglected name. Kästner, Herder, Ostertag, and others lifted up their voices; and now, when Germany calls the roll of her heroes in Science and Literature, Kepler is never forgotten. Busts and statues of him are to be found in public places in various parts of Germany; (in Regensburg; in the Walhalla not far from that city; in Kremsmünster; in the polytechnicum at Karlsruhe, and the Nicolai-Church in Hamburg;) votive tablets have been erected to his memory in the several towns in which he lived; streets have been named after him in numerous important cities; a grand edition of his complete works is in process of publication; (seven volumes have already appeared;) and, as a lasting token of the veneration and gratitude of the whole German people, it is proposed to erect a colossal monument to him in his birthplace, Weilderstadt, in the kingdom of Würtemberg. A committee was organized for this purpose in 1860–61; since then the work has been steadily progressing, and it is expected that it will now soon be completed. It was in connection with this monument that the biography, the first installment of which is now before the public, was undertaken. In the midst of his labors as business manager of the Monument Committee, Ober-Justiz-Revisor Gruner conceived the idea of erecting a biographical monument to Kepler, which should be worthy to take its place beside the one in bronze. A biography that would be attractive to the layman, and yet satisfy the demands of Science; this was what Herr Gruner desired, and what he has aimed to produce. He had no desire to shine; he knew he could not do every thing himself, and so made it a point to interest competent persons to aid him in carrying out his thought. Like one about to erect a noble edifice, it was enough for him to make suggestions in drawing the plan, to furnish the necessary materials, and to find the men to build it in worthy style. He has been occupied ever since 1863 with the preliminary work necessary to such a biography; making the greatest exertions to discover every thing of interest relating to Kepler, which have resulted in the acquisition of valuable data of every description, hitherto supposed to have been lost forever. At an early stage of the work Herr Gruner succeeded in interesting the historian Capt. Neumann, who rendered valuable assistance in the search for facts. Prof. Dr. Reitlinger, of Vienna, was finally added to the number of co-laborers, and it is to him that we owe the written biography as it stands. The volume before us contains, besides the introduction and a mass of genealogical and other documents in the appendix, eight chapters, under the following heads: "Ancestry," "Birth and Childhood," "In the Monastery-School," "At the University," "Professor of Mathematics," "The Mystery of the Universe,"

"Kepler's First Marriage," "During the Persecution of the Protestants." Opposite the title-page is a magnificent steel engraving of Kepler. The head is grand, the face full of power; and it might be said of the Suabian astronomer, as once of Luther, *habet profundos oculos et mirabiles speculationes in capite suo.* We look with interest for the continuation of the work.

14.—*Pythagoras der Weise von Samos. Ein Lebensbild nach den neusten Forschungen bearbeitet von* EDUARD BALTZER. *Mit einer Uebersichts-Karte.* (Pythagoras, the Philosopher of Samos. A Life-Picture according to the Latest Investigations, by EDWARD BALTZER. With a Synoptical Map.) Nordhausen: 1868. 8vo. pp. viii, 180.

FROM Kepler and Copernicus to Pythagoras is but a step, although a long one. Every one acquainted with the history of Astronomy knows that there are passages in ancient writers which seem to point to "the philosopher of Samos" as the discoverer of the heliocentric system. Occasionally one meets with a person who, having heard of this and of the "confession" in the preface to the work "De Revolutionibus," that the author had found in ancient writers accounts of philosophers who had asserted the motion of the earth, is foolish enough to maintain that Copernicus did nothing but rehabilitate an ancient Pythagorean theory. Now, this would be exceedingly interesting if it were true; but, unfortunately, it is not. Pythagoras, whatever else he may have known, certainly knew nothing about the heliocentric theory of the universe. The whole story is founded on a blunder; the blunder of supposing that because Pythagoras taught the doctrine of a central fire, around which every thing revolved, this fire must be the sun. It is a pity that, according to Pythagoras, this fire is at the center of the earth, and the earth a hemisphere situated in the center of the universe. So that what Copernicus owed to Pythagoras directly is somewhat difficult to see. With Kepler it is somewhat different. Pythagoras's doctrine of the "harmony of the spheres" had, undoubtedly, great and direct influence on the mathematical speculations of Kepler. It should never be forgotten that Kepler was originally educated for the Church; that he went through the regular three years' training for the ministry in the theological school at Tübingen, and that he was not a little disappointed when he was tacitly excluded from that calling. But in many respects he remained a theologian his life-long. He was not content with the discovery of laws that explained a part of the Kosmos, he wanted to explain the whole, to comprehend the whole. The discovery of the true orbit of the planets, and of the plane-velocity of their motions, he regarded only as the bridge to the discovery of the mathematical harmony of the universe; a problem to the solution of which he devoted ten years of his life. He had drunk at the fountain of Pythagorean speculation, and, intoxicated,

he listened to the rapturous music of the singing stars. He, another Saul, sought what he did not find, and found what he did not seek—he found the Third Law, in which, also, the law of gravitation is contained as the blossom in the bud.

There is no history of the physical sciences, in the broad sense, which does not include the name of Pythagoras. But it is chiefly as a religious and social reformer that we find him pictured in the book, the title of which stands at the head of this notice. Much has been said, first and last, on this point, and very little of it well said. In fact, what is said about Pythagoras any way stands in the inverse ratio to what is known of him. His life is interwoven with such a mass of legend, and his doctrines so inextricably confused with those of his disciples in later times, that it is next to impossible to distinguish fact from fable in his biography, or genuine from spurious in his teachings. With Herr Eduard Baltzer, as with so many others who write books nowadays, the aim seems to be to borrow the splendor of antiquity for the purpose of making certain crudities of speculation or practice theoretically respectable. The special *marotte* which assumes the greatest prominence here is *vegetarianism*. Of the eight and forty chapters of the book *six* are on this subject! If the author had treated all the other doctrines attributed to Pythagoras with the same exhaustive (and exhausting) "thoroughness," there would have been no end to his book, but soon an end of his readers. As it is, the book has, after all, something attractive about it, so that we are inclined to think that if the writer could have contented himself with the objective point of view he might have produced a work on Pythagoras worth the printer's ink, and the trouble of reading. To be sure, he would have had to go to other and different sources for his information. He could not have undertaken, as he did, merely to reproduce, in popular form, the opinions of Röth, as developed in his "*Geschichte unsrer abendländischen Philosophie*," opinions which, though supported by astonishing learning, have found little favor among competent critics.

15.—*Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk; herausgegeben von* J. P. Lange. *Des Alten Testamentes xii Theil. Die Sprüche Salomonis; von* Dr. O. Zoeckler. *xiii Theil, Das Hohelied und der Prediger Salomonis, von* Dr. O. Zoeckler. Bielefeld und Leipzig, 1868. (Theological and Homiletical Bible-work, edited by J. P. Lange. Part XII of the Old Testament—The Proverbs of Solomon, by Dr. O. Zoeckler; also, Part XII, Ecclesiastes, by the same.) Large 8vo. pp. 220, 218.

Dr. Lange's great Biblical Commentary is already favorably known to the American public through the portions of it, on the New Testament, that have been published in this country by C. Scribner & Co., in an English form, under the editorship of Dr. P. Schaff, assisted by a number of eminent

American scholars as co-laborers. The Commentary on the New Testament is completed, in Germany, with the exception of the Book of Revelation. Of the Old Testament, five parts have thus far appeared—Genesis, Deuteronomy, Judges, and Ruth, and the two divisions announced above.

Dr. Lange, of the University of Bonn, in Prussia, himself a theologian of the first rank, and one of the chief laborers in this Bible-work, (Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, James, in part, and Genesis, being all from his hand,) has united with him a number of the fittest men in Germany for so important a task. The "work," thus far, "praises the master-hands" that have wrought it. The various parts, of course, have different degrees of merit. Dr. Lange's own productions are among the best; and the most important books are from his hand.

It is also proper to add, that Dr. Lange himself being of a thoroughly evangelical mold, in opposition to every form of those rationalistic tendencies in Germany that have, for the last half century, so greatly marred German Biblical exegesis, and rendered much of it worthless, has also selected as fellow-laborers only true evangelical men; so that this will be truly a Bible-work free from all taint of unbelief. As an illustration: a portion of the New Testament, Part IX, embracing Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, was committed to Dr. D. Schenkel, of Heidelberg, before this man revealed, as he lately has done, his unbelieving rationalism. Although, perhaps, no trace of his "false way" can be found in this work, yet Dr. Lange has decided, and announced, that this part shall be recommitted to other and safer hands.

The Commentary is, therefore, exegetical, (in a very thoroughly *critical* manner,) doctrinal, ethical, and homiletical. An entirely new critical translation is given throughout, as the basis of the Commentary. This reveals both the unbiased freedom, the wisdom, and the conscientious care for truth and light on the part of him who conceived the work. The American-English translation loses the full benefit of this, one of the chief features of the original, in retaining the common English version as the basis.

A good translation and exposition of the poetical books of the Old Testament is greatly to be desired. This is a task of no common magnitude. The scholarship, taste, and exegetical talent must necessarily be of the best class, to give us something worth the appreciation of the present Christian world.

The translation of the poetical books of Solomon is, as it ought to be, also in verse; retaining and imitating, as much as is possible and proper, the form of the Hebrew original. Dr. Zoeckler, so far as we are able to judge, has done his work well. These books deserve a more extended notice than can be given here. They have awakened much discussion, especially Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song of Songs.

We may add that the original German work, while well and substantially

gotten up, is sold at a price far below the American edition. In Germany such expensive editions would not sell. Dr. Lange, we know, is himself surprised at the cost of the American edition; yet we recommend every one who can to buy it, as it is a work of first-class merit, in some things an improvement on the original, and well worth the price.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

1.—*Revue Chrétienne. Paris. Mars; Avril; Mai.* 1868.

M. NAVILLE continues in the March and concludes in the April number of this review his articles on "The Adversaries of Philosophy," giving us five more examples, namely: Moleschott, Renan, Claude Bernard, Littré, and Auguste Comte. In the four pages devoted to M. Renan, we have a fine refutation of this author's "glittering generalities," and a refutation all the more striking because the windy apostle of materialistic pantheism is convicted out of his own mouth. Indeed, we are bound to say of all the papers, that they are both brilliant and thorough, disposing of the subterfuges and sophisms of the opponents of speculative philosophy in a masterly manner. We commend them to the consideration of those who worship at the shrines of materialism and positivism. We wish they could be put into the hands of every one of those half-thinkers who have been caught in the snares of these pernicious systems.

In the April number is presented an excellent lecture, recently delivered at Geneva, by M. Eugène Bersier (one of the editors of the Revue), on the subject of "Independent Ethics." It is known that of late years a party has arisen in France which, insisting that the moral law is sufficient for all the purposes of human existence, speculative or practical, repudiates all connection with religion and philosophy. This party has an organ, bearing the title *La Morale Indépendante*, the first number of which gave the following declaration of principles:

> "There is a law *par excellence*, conformable to reason, written in our hearts, whose voice dictates to us our rights and our duties, whose threats turn us from evil. This law is not subject to derogation or change. No power on earth can free us from it. It has no need of commentator or interpreter. It is the same every where, the same to-day and to-morrow; it embraces all peoples and all ages. Not to obey it is to disown one's self, to despoil one's self of his character as a human being, to inflict the most terrible penalty, even though one escape all punishment [usually accounted such]."

These are the "noble and proud words" which M. Bersier quotes to show what the school of "independent ethics" proposes. But he says, in reading them he has a vague recollection of having met with them before, and finds that they have been borrowed from Cicero, "taken literally from the third book, chapter twenty-second. of his Republic." Why does not the

journal which gives them as its own indicate the source? he asks. "Perhaps it would have been embarrassing to cite those which immediately follow; for Cicero continues, in substance: 'Every-where, in all times, this immutable and holy law will reign, and with it will reign God, the master and the king of the world—God, who made, promulgated, and sanctioned it.'" Of course, it would not have done for the organ of a school which utterly ignores God in ethics to draw attention, in its programme, to this thought of the pagan philosopher, which is in flagrant contradiction with its thesis. M. Bersier does not, however, content himself with pointing out such indications of weakness; he proceeds to test, in all possible directions, the soundness of the fundamental dogma of the new school. Among other things, he demonstrates clearly that, while this school boasts of being the lineal descendant and heir of Kant, it is, in reality, at war with the fundamental thought of the great philosopher, as developed in the "Critique of the Practical Reason," namely: that "if God can not be proved scientifically, we are compelled to believe in him by the same necessity which compels our belief in duty." God, the triumph of the moral order, and personal immortality—these are, according to Kant, the inseparable corollaries of ethics, or, to employ his own term, the postulates of the practical reason. The article is a fine discussion of the essential relation of morals to religion, and we look with interest for the work which we understand M. Bersier has in press, on this subject.

A large part of the May number is taken up with a most thorough and searching review of M. Vacherot's new work on Religion. The paper is divided into six sections, the first two of which are devoted to a brilliant comparison of the work under consideration with that of Benjamin Constant on the same subject, published forty years ago. The age in which each was written is depicted with a few masterly strokes, and each is shown to be the legitimate offspring of its time and of the forces at work therein. But how different the conclusion to which they come! Constant was of the opinion that religion is natural to man, and by its very nature immortal; Vacherot regards it only as an accident of man's history, at best only a phase in his development, and destined to disappear entirely. With Constant it is only the form which is evanescent; with Vacherot the substance vanishes also. In distinguishing the immutable and universal religious sentiment from the variable and perfectible religious form, Constant took an immense step toward a proper estimate of the essence of religion; in confounding the appearance with the essence, Vacherot cuts himself off from the possibility of understanding his subject. Yet his book is, nevertheless, exceedingly able, and the reviewer, although differing with him *toto cælo*, treats him with the greatest respect, confessing that the work before him "has nothing in common with the attacks directed against religion by light and superficial minds."

2.—*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1869. *Zweites Heft.*

A RICH table of contents presents itself to us in the current number of this exceedingly valuable periodical. Prof. Diestel opens with a long (58 pages) and interesting article on the "Church Estimate of the Old Testament." We suppose it to be the pith and marrow of an extensive work which the author published last year, ("History of the Old Testament in the Christian Church,") wherein he gives a detailed account of the scientific treatment, theological appreciation, and practical application of the sacred books of the Hebrews in the Church. But, besides being interesting, the article contains a mine of information, and will repay the most careful perusal. Next, we have a series of "Observations," by Dr. Sieffert, on the doctrines of Paul, and more particularly in regard to the relation of the Epistle to the Galatians to the Epistle to the Romans. These observations are directed against the Tübingen theory concerning the genuineness of the Pauline letters, and present points well worthy of notice by persons who have made a special study of the subject. Next follows a lecture delivered before the Evangelical Union in Hanover, by Dr. Fr. Düsterdieck, on "Ancient Christian Worship," which contains, in pleasing form, much that is interesting to the general reader, but nothing that is new to scholars. This is followed by an article, by Dr. Von Bethmann-Hollweg, on the "State-Veto in the Election of Bishops," suggested by the difficulty between the Grand Duchy of Baden and the Roman Curia concerning the archbishopric of Freiburg. The concluding article is one by Diaconus Gundert on "The Sojourn of the Apostle Peter in Rome;" an exceedingly able and scholarly paper, which shows conclusively that there is not one iota of proof, or even a probability, that Peter ever was in Rome. It is particularly gratifying to read so clear and straightforward a statement and discussion of the question after having been surfeited with such a medley of false citation and disingenuous reasoning as the "Catholic World" (June number) spreads before its readers in the article headed "St. Peter, First Bishop of Rome."

3.—*Theologischer Jahresbericht—von* WILHELM HAUCK. *Vierter Jahrgang. Zweites Quartalheft, über die Schriften des Jahres* 1868, *von April bis Juni.* Wiesbaden: Julius Niedner. 1869. Philadelphia: Schaefer & Koradi.

THIS Quarterly Report covers 270 pages, and, as it notices only the publications of three months, is itself, in its extent, a proof of the activity of the German theological mind in a literary way. Every department of theological literature is here represented. We notice, especially, a number of productions on the person of Christ, both from the rationalistic and the evangelical stand-point. This is, at present, one of the most exciting questions in Germany, and promises to be so yet for some time to come. Every side

of the great question, "Who is Christ?" "What think you of Christ?" is brought into light. History, ancient and modern, general and special, occupies a large space in the Report, as also does Ascetic religious literature, which has such a large development in Germany. We find, as usual, translations, expositions, and commentaries of various parts of the Bible. Hauck's *Theologischer Jahresbericht* gives perhaps the fullest and best notice of the theological and religious publications in Germany. We find here not only the names of new works, but the character and contents of the most important ones are also given impartially, and at considerable length.

4.—*Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Jahrgang* 1869. *Zweites Heft. Drittes Heft.*

The second and third numbers of this first-class German theological quarterly, for the present year, are, as usually, freighted with articles of interest and solid worth. In the second, under the head of *Abhandlungen*—elaborate original articles—we have, 1, The third article from Riehm "On the Characteristics of the Messianic Prophecies, and their relation to the fulfillment thereof;" 2, The Epistle to the Ephesians, by Kiere. The minor articles embrace psychologico-moral remarks with reference to the History and Doctrine of the Fall, by Sack; a review, by Tholuck, of Dorner's History of Protestant Theology; another, by Ruetschli, of Kamphausen's "The Prayer of the Lord Explained;" also, the Programme of the Society of the Hague for Defense of the Christian Religion, for 1868. In the third number we have a very complete and admirable sketch of Dr. Rothe, by Achelis; an article by Dietz, on the Doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures; and one by Kloepper, on the Meaning and Purpose of Romans v, 12–21; besides a number of smaller articles—all of interest.

5.—*Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung, zugleich ein Archiv für die neuste Geschichte und Statistik der Christlichen Kirche. Achtundzwanzigster Jahrgang.* 1869. *Januar, Februar, Maerz, April.* Darmstadt und Leipzig: Eduard Zernin.

This is one of the most valuable and substantial of the German Protestant journals. Its stand-point is Lutheran, but free and liberal. It is evidently not inspired by the strict and fierce Old Lutheran exclusionism and confessionalism that yet characterize some of the Lutherans of Germany and America who still glory in the *damnamus secus docentes* of the old Augsburg Confession. It is also evangelical; free from the destructive Rationalism that corrupts and disfigures so much of German Protestant theology and literature. The *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung* has undertaken, as one of its chief tasks, (its *aufgabe*, as the Germans would say,) to defend, bravely

and nobly, the great Protestant principles and victories against the present encroachments and arrogant demands of Rome. It does this with a vigorous power, an elevation, and a deep earnestness that are truly refreshing. All the great questions that agitate the religious world, not only in Europe, but elsewhere—chiefly, of course, in Germany—are discussed here. A lively interest is manifested in the progress of evangelical light and religious freedom every-where. As an *Archiv*, it gives us a very extensive view of the chief phenomena in the religious world, and does this with a freshness that is attractive. A characteristic and very valuable monthly supplement to the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung* is the *Theologische Literaturblatt*, a theological literary monthly bulletin, giving critical and extended notices of the most important theological productions that come from the press of Germany and the neighboring countries. The *Kirchenzeitung* is issued weekly, but sent out, also, monthly, in paper covers. Like all German religious journals, it is double columned, in quarto form, convenient for binding, and admirably printed. We welcome and commend this monthly visitor from the German land.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Life of John James Audubon, the Naturalist. Edited by his Widow. With an Introduction by Jas. Grant Wilson. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 1869.

My Recollections of Lord Byron; and those of Eye-witnesses of his Life. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Foreign Missions: their Relations and Claims. By RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., LL. D., Late Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

Studies in General Science. By ANTOINETTE BROWN BLACKWELL. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 1869.

Alice's Adventures in Wonder-Land. By LEWIS CARROLL. Illustrated. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1869.

Little Women; or, Meg, Jo, Beth, and Amy. Part Second. By LOUISA M. ALCOTT. Illustrated. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1869.

Men, Women, and Ghosts. By ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS, author of "The Gates Ajar," etc. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869.

Waterloo; a Sequel to the Conscript of 1813. Translated from the French of ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN. Illustrated. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

Oldtown Folks. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," etc. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869.

Pre-Historic Nations; or, Inquiries Concerning some of the Great Peoples and Civilizations of Antiquity, and their Probable Relation to a still Older Civilization of the Ethiopians or Cushites of Arabia. By JOHN D. BALDWIN, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

Poems. By AUGUSTA COOPER BRISTOL. Boston: Adams & Co. 1869.

The Villa on the Rhine. By BERTHOLD AUERBACH. Author's Edition, with Portrait, and Biographical Sketch by Bayard Taylor. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1869.

Mental Photographs. An Album for Confessions of Tastes, Habits, and Convictions. Edited by ROBERT SAXTON. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1869.

THE

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1869.

I.—THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE.

The Oneness of the Christian Church. By REV. DORUS CLARKE, D. D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1869.

Which is the Church? or, Which one of the Present Organized Religious Bodies is Identical in History and Doctrine with the Church established by the Apostles? By REV. G. W. SOUTHWELL, of the Diocese of Western New York. New York: H. B. Durand. 1868.

Christian Unity. By A CATHOLIC CLERGYMAN. "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." 1869.

Free Religious Association. Proceedings at the First Annual Meeting of the Free Religious Association, held in Boston, May 28 and 29, 1868. Boston: Adams & Co.

Proceedings of the late Presbyterian Assemblies on Reunion. 1868–9.

IT is no longer doubtful that the people are growing tired of the present divided condition of Christendom. The evidence of this fact is too overwhelming to allow it to be questioned. In both the old and the new world religious society is greatly unsettled, and is evidently in a transition state. The old dogmas, which have so long been authoritative in religious matters, are rapidly loosing their hold on the convictions of the people, while there is very generally an apparent earnest inquiry for something better—something more in harmony with the present and eternal interests of men. This feeling manifests itself in almost every religious assembly; and so strong is it in many of the Protestant parties that it is with considerable difficulty the managers are able to keep the rank and file

within their proper places. Nor is this all. The leaven has reached the clergy, and many of them are speaking words full of promise for the Church of the future. What will be the result of this state of things can not now, of course, be determined. Enough, however, is already known to enable us to see that religious society will soon be divided into three great classes:

1. Those who are guided by human *authority.*
2. Those who are guided by human *reason.*
3. Those who are guided by the Divine *Word.*

Romanism will absorb the first class, Rationalism the second, and Christianity the third. Hence, it is evident that the religious contest of the future will be between a pretended infallible Church, a pretended infallible Science, and a truly infallible Book. This classification presents the real issue; and as religious parties are already arranging themselves for the contest, it becomes every one to determine at once upon which side he will be found.

It is almost certain that Protestantism, as it now exists, will not survive many more years. The disintegrating process is rapidly going on, and, from present appearances, will soon have done its work. A portion of the Protestant Churches, such as have ritualistic tendencies, will most likely unite with the Roman hierarchy; others, who see no good in Catholicism, and who have lost faith in a supernatural religion, will identify themselves with the Rationalistic movement; but by far the greater part will attempt to form a union upon some common platform, where they can work together in sending the Gospel to the nations, and rejoice together in "keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." It is to this last class that we confidently look for aid in forming what must be the Church of the future. Let us now consider some of the characteristics of that Church.

I. It will be characterized by organic unity.

It would be easy enough to show that this proposition must be true, or else the world can never be converted to Christ. It is simply absurd to suppose that a mythical thing—such as is generally understood by the "invisible Church"—can even be the "pillar and support of the truth" in the rugged conflicts which that truth makes with the world. The work which the Church has to accomplish requires something more than an indefinite nondescript—such

as many have decided the Church to be. What is necessary to the success of the Gospel is a definite, earnest, Scriptural organization, called the Church, not a fanciful thing, which has existence only in the dreams of benevolent sectarians, or the imagination of philanthropic latitudinarians.

It is evident, however, that a proper view of this subject is rapidly taking hold of the thinking minds of all religious parties, and this fact is one of the hopeful signs of the times. Men are coming to see the absurdity of a position which assumes that Christ established a large number of sects, and that the good and true in all these constitute his Church on earth. Dr. Clarke, the title of whose late work is at the head of this paper, gives utterance, in the following paragraph, to what must be conceded as a fair and Scriptural statement of the case:

"The oneness of the Church was evidently a very favorite object with its Founder. 'That they all may be one,' was a prayer, which, by its frequent repetitions, shows that it came from the deepest place in his heart. It was not simply Christian unity for which he so fervently interceded, for all real Christians are necessarily 'one' with him in feeling; but it was Church unity as well—unity which he foresaw would be destroyed by schism, and which he would have restored, it being the only irrefragable proof to the 'world' that the Father had 'sent' him. It was an open organic unity—a unity which could be seen by the 'world,' that he alleged to be necessary to convince the 'world' of the divinity of his mission. It was an organic unity, far deeper than any mere Christian unity, however fervid, and on which such emotional unity must rest, if it would escape the suspicion of insincerity, and seal the lips of gainsayers. It was a oneness of belief as well as a oneness of emotion; a oneness of ecclesiastical polity as well as a oneness of Christian experience; a oneness of Church practice as well as a oneness of devotional spirit. Both, *all* are covered by a correct interpretation of these tender, iterated, and reiterated supplications of the 'world's' Redeemer. He prayed that the Church he was about to leave might be as truly, as fully, as heartily 'one' as himself and the Father 'are one;' but it is morally impossible that all his children can be 'perfect in one' in the same endearing, intimate sense in which the Father and the Son are 'one,' so long as they are separated by the broad chasms of denominational prejudice and non-communion. There are no denominational walls between the Father and the Son; there are none between the Son and his disciples, and there should be none between the disciples themselves. Were it so, the 'world' could not long remain unconvinced that Christianity is from heaven." (Pp. 12, 13.)

These are certainly brave words to be uttered in the presence of the sectarian establishments which every-where disgrace the map of Christendom. And yet, the day when there was danger in uttering them is past. Men have, in a large measure, ceased to fear ecclesias-

tical courts. It is no longer positive evidence that a man is a heretic because he "speaks forth the words of truth and soberness," and "contends earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

The Rev. Mr. Southwell sees also that the present divided state of Protestantism is not only antiscriptural, but "presents to a candid and inquiring mind serious difficulties." He opens his investigation with the following truthful paragraph:

> "It is evident, from the New Testament Scriptures, that the apostles established a Church; that it originated at Jerusalem, and that it spread from thence into all parts of the world. From the same source it is also evident that the apostles established but *one* Church; that it was a visible, organized body, having rulers, or a ministry, subjects, or membership, and laws of government; that in that age it was every-where known as such; and that it was to exist till the end of the world. 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' These are facts clearly gathered from the New Testament." *

The foolish arguments which follow do not, in the slightest degree, invalidate the truth of these statements. Because the reverend gentleman finally reaches the conclusion that the "Protestant Episcopal Church only is identical in history and doctrine with the Church established by the Apostles," and is, therefore, "THE CHURCH," it does not follow that his reasoning is wrong concerning the visibility and oneness of the Church. His difficulty is plain. He sees that the numerous sects of the present do not correspond with the Church as it existed in the times of the Apostles; but, since the Church must exist somewhere, he thinks he finds in the Episcopal sect the conditions essential to identity with the Primitive Church. There is certainly consistency between his premises and part of his conclusion; but his fallacy consists in supposing that because there was only *one* Church in the beginning, the Episcopal organization is now that Church. This may or may not be true; still, the argument for one visible, organized Church remains unshaken. The effort to settle the question as to "Which is the Church," by an appeal to the argument of succession, is simply ridiculous, and can only be excused in men like Mr. Southwell, who feel that something must be done to relieve the present distress. But the Church of the future will not rely on this historical argument. It will rely simply upon identity in faith and practice with the Apostolic Church.

But to conclude what we have to say on the oneness of the

* "Which is the Church?" p. 3.

Church. Suppose some one should contend that "the Apostolic Church—the Church of Christ—is an invisible Church." Then let this be clearly shown from the New Testament. To this divine record we make our appeal, and we solemnly pledge ourselves to accept its decisions. But if it should be said that "the Church of the New Testament was a visible, organized body, but it is now invisible, and the various denominations are so many branches of this invisible Church," then we demand the authority for this change. We want to know how and when this important change took place. Again: if it be said that "the Church is not a definitely organized body, but is made up of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, whether members of any denominations or not," let it be shown that this is the Scriptural idea of the Church—that the Apostles established such a one, wrote letters to it, and that the conquests of the Gospel in Apostolic times were achieved, not through a definite, visible, united organization, but through a multitude of rival sects, without any proper unity or organization whatever. In settling these matters we make our appeal to Divine authority. We are not willing to accept as decisive any thing that is not found in the New Testament, for the stream of Church history becomes muddy too soon after the Apostolic period to be implicitly relied upon. Those, therefore, who would destroy the visible identity of the Church, must either show that their conception of it is what the Apostles did actually establish, or else show where the Apostles authorized the change. Neither of these, we are persuaded, can ever be done. Hence, we conclude that if the Church of the future is to be identical with the Apostolic Church, it must be characterized by organic unity.

II. It will have spiritual unity.

This proposition looks to the subjective state of the Church, and is much more difficult to properly dispose of than the first; for it is altogether more difficult to detect the differences here than in those objective conditions which are palpable to all. And yet, it is by no means certain that the amount of spiritual unity among the religious parties is greatly in excess of organic unity. It is easy enough, under the influence of a sort of pseudo-Christian charity, to get up a fine appearance of fraternal harmony—to be all things to all men, that by all means we may be *nothing*. But this is not what we understand by

spiritual unity. Nor is this what the Holy Scriptures teach as such. There is, perhaps, no subject that needs a more thoughtful and earnest investigation than the one now under consideration.

In the July number of the *Methodist Quarterly*, the leading article is on "Tests of a Valid Ministry, and a True Church," and is by Dr. Janes, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This article is as remarkable for its *non sequiturs* as it is for its liberality. It is difficult to know which to condemn more, its latitudinarianism or its sectarianism. The article is an effort to show that the Methodist Episcopal Church is identical with the Apostolic Church; and in order to propitiate other denominations, the Bishop opens in the following *suaviter in modo* style:

"It is one of the advantages and beauties of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that there is nothing in her religious faith, or education, or polity, that embarrasses our fellowship with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. We can commune with them, work with them, just as far as their catholicity will permit. General delight in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ is not incompatible with special delight in a particular branch of that Church. We may love a large circle of friends very sincerely and earnestly, and yet one of them may be the object of our special regard and joy. We do not love other Churches less because we love the Methodist Episcopal Church more. Nor in asserting the validity of her ministry, and the genuineness of her Churchdom, are we obliged to invalidate other ministries, or unchurch other denominations. It is in perfect charity toward others, therefore, that we assert our claim to be a true ministry and Church on the New Testament basis."

This extract is valuable for at least two reasons. 1st. It is an *authoritative* statement of the faith of a large and influential religious body on an important subject. 2d. It shows conclusively that the Methodist Episcopal Church is a most convenient organization with which to be identified; for, while it claims to be the Church of Christ—identical in faith and practice—it does not deny the same claim to all other Churches, no matter how wide the difference between them may be, provided only the "catholicity" of the other Churches "will permit." This is charity with a vengeance! But it is just the kind of charity that apologizes for the shameful divisions of Protestantism.

We have already seen that there is but *one* Church, and that all other religious organizations differing from it in faith and practice are sects, and, as such, can not have the approbation of our Heavenly Father. Hence, if the Methodist Episcopal Church is the Church

of Christ—and Bishop Janes affirms that it is—then we are compelled to "invalidate other ministries," and "unchurch other denominations," no matter how kindly we may be disposed toward them. It is one thing to admit the Christian character of a man, and it is quite another to grant that the Church to which he belongs is the Church of Christ. Because I am willing to allow that there are Christians among the sects, it does not follow that I am to allow also that all these sects, or any of them, are identical with the Church founded by the Apostles. Christian charity must not be substituted for spiritual unity. Just here is a point which needs to be well understood. We must not dogmatize as to Christian *character*, for it is not always easy to determine the conditions upon which it depends; but if we may not speak with certainty as to *what is the Church of Christ*, then is it simply impossible to know any thing concerning the will of God to men.

The unity of the spirit involves unity of faith and practice. The Disciples at Ephesus were enjoined to keep "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," because there is "one body," "one spirit," "one hope," "one Lord," "one faith," "one baptism," and "one God and father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all." Furthermore, the Corinthians were exhorted to all "speak the same thing," to have "no divisions among them," to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." And the reason given for this is, that they had all been baptized, in the name of Christ, "by one spirit into one body," whether they were Jews or Gentiles, whether they were bond or free, and had been "all made to drink into one spirit." Now, we ask, in all candor, Is it possible for any one to assign these as reasons why the sects of the present day should keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace? As a matter of fact we know that they are not all "one body," are not guided by the "one spirit," have not the "one hope," do not follow the "one Lord," do not walk by the "one faith," and are not baptized with the "one baptism." Hence, it is easy to see that any unity among the sects is no more spiritual than organic unity. It is simply an attempt to do what all earnest, good men feel ought to be done, but is largely destitute of the elements necessary to permanent success. It is an expression of the outgrowth of Christian charity over the walls of denominationalism, but lacks the vital force of the union

principle which can alone give a practical example of the fulfillment of the Savior's prayer, when he said, "Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

We are now prepared to affirm that a union among the sects is simply impossible, and if it were possible, it is by no means desirable. Such a union, in the very nature of things, could only be temporary, and would, most likely, postpone indefinitely that union for which the Savior prayed. Hence the Church of the future will not be a union of Protestant sects; nor, again, a fanciful union of all the good and pious in these sects, but will rather seek the complete demolition of sects as essential to the fulfilling of her glorious mission.

That the good and pious of all parties, after the destruction of sects, will ultimately unite with the Church, we do not for a moment doubt. Some of these may do so, and will do so, even before the final end of sectarianism is reached. But we apprehend a large majority will remain where they are until the deceptive plea that we can have spiritual unity *without Church unity* is thoroughly understood. But when the good and the pious of all parties shall attain to this knowledge, the days of sectarianism will be numbered. Hence, we conclude, and we think reasonably, that the first thing essential to a true spiritual unity is to have a clear understanding of *what it is.* Such an understanding we believe the Church of the future will have, consequently we are encouraged to hope that the time is not long till all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, in deed and in truth, will "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

III. The Church of the future will accept nothing but the Word of God as its Rule of Faith and Practice.

This is a cardinal point, and is worthy of very earnest consideration. The present divisions among religious parties had their origin largely in the failure of the professed followers of Christ to appreciate the fact that the only law by which Christians are governed is a *Divine* law. Hence, as it has been truly said, "Christian unity can result from nothing short of the destruction of creeds and confessions of faith, inasmuch as human creeds and confessions have destroyed Christian unity;" and that "whenever the setting aside of creeds and

confessions shall be attempted, Christians will give to the world, and to angels, and to themselves proof that they do believe the Word of God." Observe, it is the Word of God *alone* that we contend for as an authoritative rule of faith and practice. Most religious parties already claim to be governed by the Word of God; but they do not stop here. They are governed by the Word of God *plus* a human creed. It is this addition to which we object. It is this that must be abandoned before it is possible to have union among Christians.

But it is claimed that the creed is nothing more than the human interpretation of the Word, and that this will exist whether written or not; and that therefore the plea for the Bible and the Bible alone is practically "a deceptive plea," and is only "a bid for popular favor." Now this all looks very well. Indeed, the "popular favor" part is especially good. From this it would appear that there must be a suspicion in the minds of the apologists for human creeds that the hearts of the people are not severely wedded to the idols of sectarianism. And such, we opine, is about the fact in the case. Nevertheless, the objection suggests an important inquiry, namely: Can the Word of God be infallibly understood? We now ask attention to the consideration of this question.

If we consider the Bible as a whole—its history, doctrine, philosophy, etc.—then it is absolutely certain that all can not infallibly understand it, if, indeed, any can. When we take into account the difficulties Divine Wisdom had to overcome in making a revelation to man, it is wonderful that the Bible is as plain a book as it is. Among other obstacles two were especially prominent:

1. The incapacity of human language to express definitely and clearly the Divine thoughts.

2. The sinfulness of man—consequently the incompatibility between the Divine and human—the character of the message, and the character of him for whom it was intended.

With men these would seem to be insuperable difficulties in the way of such a revelation as man needed; but "with God all things are possible." One of the most interesting studies, in connection with the Bible, is the method which Divine Wisdom employed in making that blessed Book intelligible. To follow the gradual development of spiritual ideas in harmony with the growth of language, to behold every-where the wisdom displayed in dealing with man's stubborn and

sinful nature; and to feel the perfect adaptation of means to the great end to be accomplished, is altogether one of the strongest evidences we have of the Divine origin of the Bible. Still, it must be confessed that the Bible is not wholly free from difficulties, and it is doubtful whether it is possible for all to understand every thing in it in precisely the same way. As a matter of fact, we know that they do not so understand it.

It is absurd, however, to suppose that the Bible teaches some eighty or more different systems of truth. And yet we have no less than that number of religious denominations in this country, all differing from each other in what they conceive to be important particulars. Now, why is this? Is it because of contradictions in the Bible? Surely not. Is it because of insurmountable difficulties? We do not think so. Is it because of the obliquity of men's moral perceptions? This, doubtless, has something to do with it, but *ought* not to account for the fact. But again: Is it because men are not honest, and allow their prejudices to control their interpretations of Divine Truth? It can not be denied that this has much to do in bringing men to a diversity of conclusions upon the subject of the Christian religion. But it is not a justifiable reason for the present distracted state of Christendom, nor can we *account* for the present state on this hypothesis. It is certainly fair to conclude that the majority of Christian people are honest, and take no delight in being wrong upon the most important subject with which they have to do. The question, then, again recurs: Can the Bible be infallibly understood? Can Christians all "speak the same thing," "be of the same mind, and the same judgment?"

Without entering particularly upon the subject of hermeneutics, we desire to suggest some principles, which, we think, if carefully observed, will conduct us to infallible certainty as to the meaning of the Bible *upon all matters that we need to understand.* First, then, we call attention to the following statement of M. Cousin:

"To-day, as in all time, two great wants are felt by man. The first, the most imperious, is that of fixed, immutable principles, which depend upon neither times, nor places, nor circumstances, and on which the mind reposes with an unbounded confidence. In all investigations, as long as we have seized only isolated, disconnected facts, as long as we have not referred them to a general law, we possess the materials of science, but there is yet no science. Even physics commence only when universal truths appear, to which all the facts of the same order that obser-

vation discovers to us in nature may be referred. Plato has said that there is no science of the transitory.

"This is our first need. But there is another, not less legitimate—the need of not being the dupe of chimerical principles, of barren abstractions, of combinations more or less ingenious, but artificial; the need of resting upon reality and life, the need of experience. The physical and natural sciences, whose regular and rapid conquests strike and dazzle the most ignorant, owe their progress to the experimental method, which is carried to such an extent that one would not now condescend to lend the least attention to a science over which this method should not seem to preside." *

What is here stated is universally felt to be true. But how shall these wants be supplied? And if supplied, will they enable us to solve the problem of Biblical interpretation? Archimedes said that if he had a fulcrum for his lever he could raise the world from its center. This suggests the present need of hermeneutics. It has no reliable fulcrum—no fixed, immutable principles with which to begin an investigation. But these we must have if we ever arrive at infallible certainty in reference to the teachings of the Word of God.

Mr. Clarke gives us four rules, which he imagines is the panacea needed.

1. Apply to the Scriptures the same rules of interpretation which we use to determine the meaning of all other books.

2. The analogy of faith; or, the general belief of the Church in all ages.

3. Inquire what doctrines are acceptable, and what repulsive, to the natural feelings of the heart.

4. The experimental; or, a practical compliance with the will of God, so far as we now know it.

That these are valuable rules, or principles of interpretation, can not be doubted, especially the first and last. But they all fail to furnish the fulcrum necessary to reach infallible certainty.

Perhaps a few passages of Scripture may assist us in finding a true starting point in the work before us. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." † "Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord." ‡ "In thy light shall we see light." § It will be seen from these passages that the *way* to knowledge is through "the obedience of faith." Faith and duty *first*, and *then* knowledge, is the Divine order. Hence, the words of Anselm are

* Lectures on the True, the Beautiful, and the Good, pp. 40, 41.
† John vii, 17. ‡ Hos. vi, 3. § Psalm xxxvi, 9.

not only true, but furnish us the key to the whole subject of Biblical interpretation. He said: "I do not *know* in order that I may *believe*, but I *believe* in order that I may *know*." Mansel says: "Action, and not knowledge, is man's destiny and duty in this life; and his highest principles, both in philosophy and religion, have reference to this end."* The trouble, however, with men is, they seek to know first, and to believe and do afterward. This is wholly unphilosophical and unscriptural, and has been the immediate or remote cause of all wrong interpretations of the Bible. When Adam was created he was made "upright," consequently the test of his fidelity to God was placed *beneath* him. "Thou shalt *not*" was the strong arm upon which he rested. Had he been called to a higher life it would not have so severely tried him. He was *positively* good, and *passive* in obedience—he had only to stand erect in the Divine image, and all would be well. But since the transgression, the test of faith has been placed on the other side of man, and now reads "thou shalt." His faith must now become *active*, and his obedience *positive*, in order that he may be restored to the Divine favor. *Knowledge* was placed before him by Satan, to induce him to transgress the will of God; *knowledge* is now placed before him by Christ, as an incentive to do that will. In the first case, knowledge subordinated faith—went before faith; but in the last case, faith must have the precedence. Hence, in the remedial system, faith and obedience are essential to membership in the Church of Christ, while knowledge is simply a means of *enjoyment.*

From the foregoing considerations we are now prepared to affirm that in studying the Bible we must determine:

1. Those things that are essential to Church membership.
2. Those things that will increase our enjoyment in the Church.

We have already seen that faith and obedience comprehend all that is necessary to the first; and that knowledge is a condition of the second. Hence, the whole question of Church-fellowship properly turns on this simple statement: *Faith in Christ, as the Son of the living God, and obedience to his commandments.* This confines the question to the domain of *faith*—where it rightfully belongs—and makes salvation, through the Church, possible to every creature. There need be no controversy concerning this simple test of Chris-

* Limits of Religious Thought, p. 146.

tian fraternity, and there will be none, if knowledge is confined to its legitimate sphere, and is not allowed to start curious questions concerning what is purely a matter of faith. Hence, we conclude, that the Bible, so far as it relates to Church fellowship, may be infallibly understood, and that in reference to matters of faith, Christians every-where may "speak the same thing," may be "perfectly joined together," may "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

But is it not possible that some may make mistakes in reference to even these simple matters? Doubtless. But this does not invalidate our claim for infallible certainty and perfect unity. We do not question the fact that many honest persons have failed to meet *all* the conditions of Church membership. They have done what they conscientiously felt was right in the premises. They have had the *spirit* of obedience; but have not fulfilled all the requirements of the *letter.*

Now, it will help us at this point to consider the fact that the Christian world is at present in an extraordinary state. Surely, the divisions which every-where disgrace the professed followers of Christ is not the normal condition of Christianity. Hence, in disposing of the honest failures of men to meet *all* the conditions of salvation, we must ever remember that this extraordinary state of things can not be overcome suddenly, but will require much time and patience before the faith and practice of the Primitive Church can be fully restored. Meanwhile, it is the duty of all who see the light to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." But, at the same time, it is equally their duty to exercise *charity* toward all who are honestly striving to do the will of God, though their obedience may not be perfect in every respect.

This is the spirit of the movement in which we are engaged, and we think it is the spirit which should govern all who are laboring for a restoration of Apostolic Christianity. This was the spirit that animated the noble reformers of the last half century. They took into account the extraordinary condition of things. Hence, they did not expect a perfect restoration of Primitive Christianity in a day. They labored earnestly and patiently toward that end. Their religious movement sought to unite all who love the Lord Jesus Christ on the "one foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." But they did not arbitrarily send

every body to perdition who did not accept their plea for reformation. Was their plea any the less grand on that account? Were their principles any the less true? We think not.

In justice to Alexander Campbell we deem it proper to give his views on this subject. We feel this to be necessary for two reasons:

1. There are those who, doubtless, honestly believe that it was Mr. Campbell's purpose to build up a narrow, sectarian, proscriptive party, whose business was to send every body to perdition who did not accept the dialect of the Reformation. We do not think there is any justifiable ground for such a conclusion; for whoever will take the trouble to look into the history of the movement with which he was connected, will soon see that this was not its spirit or intention. Nevertheless, as such an impression prevails in the minds of some, caused doubtless by misrepresentations of the character of the movement, we deem it necessary to make known the facts in the case.

2. There is another class, who see nothing in friendly overtures to the sects but "departure from the original purpose and spirit of the Reformation." Should some one affirm the possibility of the salvation of any who are not entirely out of the smoke of Babylon, and be disposed to fraternize with them to some extent, he would be at once declared "unsound," as "reforming the Reformation," "compromising with the sects," and, to make the case as hideous as possible, he would be declared an "expediency and progress man." It might be well for these exceedingly orthodox brethren to look over a little history of the past, and learn who it is they are denouncing before their peculiar style of speech becomes stereotyped.

The following article was written by Mr. Campbell, in 1837, at a time when he had reached his most mature manhood. It was written, as he subsequently tells us, to reprove some who were in the habit of "greatly and unreasonably abusing the sects, or countenancing, aiding, and abetting them that did so, and who made Christianity to turn more upon immersion than upon *universal holiness*."* The article is a reply to a sister from Lunenburg, and is as follows:

"In reply to this conscientious sister I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, pagans; and, therefore, no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries, there has been no Church of Christ, no Christians

* Millennial Harbinger. New Series. Vol. I. 1837. P. 566.

in the world; and the promises concerning the *everlasting* Kingdom of the Messiah have failed, and the *gates of hell have prevailed against his Church!* This can not be; and, therefore, there are Christians among the sects.

"But who is a Christian? I answer, every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things, according to his measure of knowledge of his will. *A perfect man in Christ*, or a perfect Christian, is one thing; and a 'babe in Christ' a stripling in the faith, or an imperfect Christian, is another. The New Testament recognizes both the perfect man and the imperfect man in Christ. The former, indeed, implies the latter. Paul commands the imperfect Christians to be perfect, (2 Cor. iii, 2;) and says he wishes the perfection of Christians. 'And this also we wish,' for you *saints* in Corinth, 'even your perfection;' and again he says, 'We speak wisdom among the perfect,' (1 Cor. ii, 6;) and he commands them to be 'perfect in understanding,' (1 Cor. xiv, 20;) and in many other places implies or speaks the same things. Now, there is perfection of will, of temper, and of behavior. There is a perfect state and a perfect character; and hence, it is possible for Christians to be imperfect in some respects without an absolute forfeiture of the Christian state and character. Paul speaks of 'carnal' Christians, of 'weak' and 'strong' Christians; and the Lord Jesus admits that some of the good and honest-hearted bring forth only thirty-fold, while others bring forth sixty, and some a hundred-fold increase of the fruits of righteousness.

"But every one is wont to condemn others in that in which he is more intelligent than they; while, on the other hand, he is condemned for his Phariseeism, or his immodesty and rash judgment of others, by those that excel in the things in which he is deficient. I can not, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state and character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy, without their own knowledge or consent, as aliens from Christ and the well-grounded hope of heaven. 'Salvation was of the Jews,' acknowledged the Messiah; and yet, he said of a foreigner—an alien from the commonwealth of Israel—a Syro-Phenician, 'I have not found so great faith; no, not in Israel.'

"Should I find a Pedobaptist more intelligent in the Christian Scriptures, more spiritually-minded, and more devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most. Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian, a Pharisee among Christians. Still, I will be asked, How do I know that any one loveth my Master but by his obedience to his commandments? I answer, *In no other way*. But mark, I do not substitute obedience to one commandment, for universal or even for general obedience. And should I see a sectarian Baptist, or a Pedobaptist, more spiritually-minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah than one who precisely acquiesces with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach, doubtless the former, rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian. So I judge, and so I feel. It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves; and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known.

"With me mistakes of the understanding and errors of the affections are not to be confounded. They are as distant as the poles. An angel may mistake the

meaning of a commandment, but he will obey it in the sense in which he understands it. John Bunyan and John Newton were very different persons, and had very different views of baptism, and of some other things; yet, they were both disposed to obey, and, to the extent of their knowledge, did obey the Lord in every thing.

"There are mistakes with and without depravity. They are willful errors, which all the world must condemn, and unavoidable mistakes, which every one will pity. The Apostles mistook the Savior when he said, concerning John, 'What if I will that John tarry till I come?' But the Jews perverted his words when they alleged that Abraham had died, in proof that he spake falsely when he said, 'If a man keep my word he shall never see death.'

"Many a good man has been mistaken. Mistakes are to be regarded as culpable, and as declarative of a corrupt heart only when they proceed from a willful neglect of the means of knowing what is commanded. Ignorance is always a crime when it is voluntary; and innocent when it is involuntary. Now, unless I could prove that all who neglect the positive institutions of Christ, and have substituted for them something else of human authority, do it knowingly, or, if not knowingly, are voluntarily ignorant of what is written, I could not, I dare not say that their mistakes are such as unchristianize all their profession.

"True, indeed, that it is always a misfortune to be ignorant of any thing in the Bible, and very generally it is criminal. But how many are there who can not read; and of those who can read, how many are so deficient in education; and of those educated, how many are ruled by the authority of those whom they regard as superiors in knowledge and piety, that they never can escape out of the dust and smoke of their own chimney, where they happened to be born and educated! These all suffer many privations and many perplexities, from which the more intelligent are exempt.

"The preachers of '*essentials*,' as well as the preachers of '*non-essentials*,' frequently err. The essentialist may disparage the heart, while the non-essentialist despises the institution. The latter makes void the institutions of Heaven, while the former appreciates not the mental bias which God loveth most. My correspondent may belong to a class who think that we detract from the authority and value of an institution the moment we admit the bare possibility of any one being saved without it. But we choose rather to associate with those who think that they do not undervalue either seeing or hearing, by affirming that neither of them, nor both of them together, are essential to life. I would not sell one of my eyes for all the gold on earth; yet I could live without it.

"There is no occasion, then, for making immersion, on a profession of the faith, absolutely essential to a Christian, though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort. My right hand and my right eye are greatly essential to my usefulness and happiness, but not to my life; and as I could not be a perfect man without them, so I can not be a perfect Christian without a right understanding and a cordial reception of immersion in its true and Scriptural meaning and design. But he that thence infers that none are Christians but the immersed, as greatly errs as he who affirms that none are alive but those of clear and full vision.

"I do not formally answer all the queries proposed, knowing the one point to which they all aim. To that point only I direct these remarks. And while I would unhesitatingly say that I think that every man who despises any ordinance of

Christ, or who is willingly ignorant of it, can not be a Christian; still, I should sin against my own convictions should I teach any one to think that if he mistook the meaning of any institution while in his soul he desired to know the whole will of God, he must perish forever. But, to conclude for the present, he that claims for himself a license to neglect the least of all the commandments of Jesus, because it is possible for some to be saved, who, through insuperable ignorance or involuntary mistake, do neglect or transgress it; or he that willfully neglects to ascertain the will of the Lord to the whole extent of his means and opportunities, because some who are defective in that knowledge may be Christians, is not possessed of the spirit of Christ, and can not be registered among the Lord's people. So I reason, and I think, in so reasoning, I am sustained by all the Prophets and Apostles of both Testaments." *

While we may not fully agree with the foregoing in every particular, it can not be denied that it fairly represents the spirit of the religious movement which had for its purpose the union of all the followers of Christ upon the Bible and the Bible alone. It is proper, however, to remark that Mr. Campbell never held these views as tests of fellowship with any one. They were simply his *opinions*, in reference to which men might conscientiously differ without in any way affecting their Christian character. He regarded the expression of them as important only so far as they might tend to give direction to the spirit of the great work in which he was engaged. But surely there is a lesson in what he has written for those who would now dogmatize concerning matters about which, to say the least, we can not be very certain. We think, furthermore, we have here some profitable suggestions to certain good men, who are determined not to be "indifferent to things indifferent" themselves—nor to let any one else be so, if they can help it. For, if such a man as Mr. Campbell was willing to exercise patience, forbearance, and brotherly kindness to persons who had failed to comply with one of the important conditions of the Gospel, it really does seem that we ought to be admonished to bear with one another when we differ only concerning the circumstantials of religion.

As already seen, there is little or no apology for being wrong in matters of faith. Every thing is so plain that the "wayfaring man, though a simpleton, need not err therein." And were it not for the extraordinary condition of things in the religious world—for which the present generation is only partially responsible—we might reasonably hold every man strictly bound to obey implicitly *every*

* Millennial Harbinger, 1837, pp. 411–414.

condition of the Gospel. But when we come to the dominion of knowledge—to that large number of questions which are not properly questions of faith—it is easy enough to see that there is much more room for misunderstanding; consequently, much more room for Christian *charity.*

It has been truly said that one of the infirmities of thought is "to commute the formal into material elements, to raise relations out of their proper category, and transport them into the category of things. This is the parent of metaphysics. It is often called the tendency to realize abstractions. Having combined certain elements of particular experiences into a single conception, we treat the concept as if it were an individual object."* But the trouble is, in religious matters, we not only elevate our reasonings into things—veritable entities—but we make these the *tests of Christian fellowship.* Men go deliberately to work to make out a given case. They apply the rules of logic until the Aristotelian system trembles under the heavy weight laid upon it, and then, suddenly, a *conclusion* is reached. Now, no one ought to object to this, and we do not know that any one does. But just as suddenly this *conclusion* is elevated to a *test* of fellowship, and has all the force of a "*thus saith the Lord.*" This is the thing to which we object; and this is the precise *origin of human creeds.* Surely, logic is not a thing to be feared, so long as it is confined to its legitimate sphere. But when we undertake to substitute the *deductions of human reason* for the plain statements of the Word of God, then it is that knowledge usurps the authority of faith, and human creeds become the bonds of religious union and communion. Then it is that the Bible ceases to be a rule of faith and duty, and becomes a mere debating ground for theological pugilists.†

We have now reached the main difficulty in taking the Word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice. The tendency of the human mind is either to speculate *about* what are properly matters

* Lewes' History of Philosophy. Prolegomena. P. lxxix.

† "The testimony of Scripture, like that of our natural faculties, is plain and intelligible when we are content to accept it as a fact intended for our practical guidance: it becomes incomprehensible only when we attempt to explain it as a theory capable of speculative analysis. We are distinctly told that there is mutual relation between God and man as distinct agents; that God influences man by his grace, visits him with rewards or punishments, regards him with love or anger; that man, within his own limited sphere, is likewise capable of 'prevailing with God;' that his prayer may obtain an answer, his conduct call down God's favor or condemnation. There is nothing self-contradictory or even

of faith, or else to substitute *for* faith what legitimately belongs to knowledge. Hence, philosophy and science are made the tests of fellowship, instead of faith and obedience. But if we make a proper distinction between faith and knowledge, then we can claim for one *unity*, and for the other, *liberty*. In reference to that which is the *essential* thing, all can see alike; in reference to that which is simply *circumstantial*, all may differ. In essentials, unity; in circumstantials, liberty; and, in all things, charity, should be the Christian's motto. This, we believe, will be the motto of the Church of the future. Hence, we will all yet "come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."*

IV. The Church of the future will wear only the name of its Founder.

Denominational names was a shrewd invention of Satan for the propagation of sects. Nothing could have been better, as the history of sectarianism fully demonstrates. It is, however, a pleasing reflection that these names no longer possess cabalistic power. The day of their influence is rapidly passing away. And surely this should be a source of rejoicing to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and pray for the unity and peace of his people.

One of the curious phases of this matter is the character of the excuses made for these denominational names. Says one: "We

unintelligible in this, if we are content to believe *that* it is so, without striving to understand *how* it is so. But the instant we attempt to analyze the ideas of God as infinite and man as finite; to resolve the Scriptural statement into the higher principles on which their possibility apparently depends; we are surrounded on every side by contradictions of our own raising; and, unable to comprehend how the Infinite and the Finite can exist in mutual relation, we are tempted to deny the fact of that relation altogether, and to seek a refuge, though it be but insecure and momentary, in Pantheism, which denies the existence of the Finite, or in Atheism, which rejects the Infinite." (Limits of Religious Thought, pp. 145, 146.)

* Eph. iv, 13, *et seq.*

must have these names, so that we may properly distinguish the various religious parties." But did it ever occur to this apologist that the very thing that needs to be done is to break down the distinctions he wants to keep up? We readily grant that if sects are to be substituted for the Church of Christ, party names are necessary; but these sects themselves are wrong, and, consequently, the names which they bring into use can not be successfully defended.

"But," says another, "such names are necessary, in order to avoid presumption. Should any one Church call itself the Church of Christ, that would be equivalent to unchurching all other religious people." Here is a clear specimen of Satan reproving sin. Think of a sectarian reproving any body for presumption! Such an idea would create a smile were it not that it is actually done. Sectarianism delivering lectures on charity is as amusing in itself as the consequences are fearful. Having usurped the place of the "one body," and having set itself up as the true exponent of Christian principles, its plea against presumption is as arrogant as it is ridiculous.

But is not the assumed modesty that rejects the New Testament name full of the suspicion that those who are guilty do not have a very abiding faith in the correctness of their religious position? Does it not indicate a want of certainty in the right to wear the name of Christ? Surely, if there was not something wrong here there would not be so much staggering at Primitive usage. A legitimate and dutiful wife never hesitates to wear the name of her husband, neither should the Church of Christ hesitate to wear the name of her husband. None but illicit claimants need tremble here.

But how can any religious people claim to be guided by the Word of God, and yet countenance the party names which are used to designate the respective sectarian organizations of the present time? Is such a thing possible? Where, in the New Testament, do we read of the "Protestant Episcopal Church," the "Methodist Episcopal Church," the "Presbyterian Church," the "Baptist Church," etc.? Echo answers, Where? Every intelligent, honest man knows well enough that no such names were known in Apostolic times. All these are of comparative modern origin, and are wholly unauthorized by the Christian Scriptures.

In answer to all this, we know that it is sometimes said, "there is nothing in a name." But, as a matter of fact, we know that there is.

And every man who is not hopelessly given up to a false theory must admit that there is. If there is nothing in a name, why use any at all? And, especially, why use different names?

But, we are further told, "It does not matter about the name we wear, so we are Christians." This sounds very well, but it has a fatal fallacy underlying it. "So we are Christians" is certainly the chief thing. But may we not fail *to be* Christians, so long as we carry about with us these strange gods? And may it not be that, having adopted these unscriptural names, our final reward will be *measured* by them? He that has been a *Presbyterian* shall receive a Presbyterian's *reward*, etc. However this may be, of one thing we are thoroughly convinced, namely: all these names are not only without divine authority, but are positively disrespectful to him who is given "to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."* And we are convinced, furthermore, that the signs of the times clearly indicate that earnest religious people are beginning to see the folly of these party designations, and, as a consequence, desire to be known only by the simple titles of the New Testament.

V. The Church of the future will be a Live, Active, Working Church.

While we are not prepared to admit that Protestanism, when compared with Infidelity or Romanism, is a failure; it is, nevertheless, an indisputable fact that most of the Protestant sects are making little or no progress in the conversion of the world. And we think it not unsafe to say that Protestantism, in its present inactive, lifeless condition, is wholly inadequate to the work of successfully contending against the Catholic and Rationalistic tendencies of the age. We have already stated that the religious contest of the future will require the disintegration of Protestantism as such; that all who love Christ more than party will unite upon the Bible and the Bible alone; that the Church of the future will be identical with the Primitive Church in faith and practice; and that the great religious struggle of the ages is yet to come, and will be between this Church, the Roman Apostasy, and the various forms of Infidelity as represented by modern Rationalism. Hence, in order that the Church may be successful in this struggle, it must be a live, active, working Church.

* Eph. i, 22.

Among the Catholics and Rationalists there is just now unusual activity. While Rome is doing little or nothing in proselyting the American people, she is rapidly gaining political power. The immense influx of population from the Catholic countries of Europe gives to the Roman Church in the United States a very decided importance as a factor in our future politics. Politicians are not unmindful of the strength of this influence, and are already in the market, willing to sell our common-school system, and barter our free institutions, for the sake of political power. Just here is the point of danger, so far as Rome is concerned. The religious influence of Catholicism in this country amounts to comparatively nothing; it is only as a political organization that the Church of Rome is to be feared. Nor would we have any reason to fear even here, were it not that politicians, as a general rule, are

> ——"unco weak,
> And little to be trusted;"

especially when the Catholic vote is likely to be decisive in any important election. Romanism is *strong* in this country only because our politicians are *weak.* But this very fact gives courage to the managers of the Catholic Church, and has infused a new life into all the agencies of that Church.

Rationalism, however, is *religiously* active. Constantly receiving re-enforcements from the literature of the Old World, it is making a desperate effort to turn the whole tide of modern culture to the advantages of Infidelity. Nor is this effort without its results. The press is every-where teeming with books and periodicals whose life-blood is saturated with Rationalistic miasma. In the name of letters and science, this modern Infidelity is rapidly inoculating the people with its deadly poison. And, as a proof of its infective qualities, we need only state that many of the leading minds of the country are already completely under its influence. These men gravely tell us that Knowledge, not only chronologically comes *before* Faith, but that it does away with Faith entirely—rules it out of the religious category. But these are not all the facts in the case. It should be understood that a number of the most prominent men of New England—men whose writings, through various periodicals, reach almost all our firesides—have formed themselves into what they

call a "Free Religious Association," for the avowed purpose of actively propagating their Rationalistic doctrines. Surely it is high time the influence of their system was broken. But this can be done only by a united, earnest, and active Church—such a one as we believe the Church of the future will be.

Christianity, as now represented by Protestantism, lacks vital force. Its ministry has no enthusiasm, and its membership is a lifeless body. Preaching is too much a profession, and worship too much of a form of godliness, without its power. Whatever of earnestness there may be sometimes manifested, is generally expended in defending sectarian tenets, rather than in spreading the Gospel and upbuilding the disciples in faith, hope, and love.

It is useless to hope that this state of things will succeed. It is simply an impossibility. Hence, all who earnestly desire the conversion of the world, should at once abandon these sectarian organizations, and unite upon the "one foundation," accept the "one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism," and then, animated by the "one hope," earnestly and actively work for the triumph of the *one* Church.

That we must ultimately come to this will not, we presume, be questioned by any right-thinking people. And that the signs of the times indicate a near approach of the period when we will have come to it, can not be reasonably doubted by those who are at all acquainted with current events. The effort to reunite the Old and New School Presbyterians is only a sign of the distress which is every-where felt among Protestants. What will come of that effort may not amount to much, but what it indicates *is worth a great deal.* We are just entering upon a great historic period for the Church. We feel that we hazard nothing in saying that within the next fifty years the battle for religious freedom will have been fought and won; the reign of Protestant sects will have terminated; and the Church of the future will have fairly entered upon her glorious mission. Then, and not till then, can we hope that despotic Romanism and insolent Rationalism will be overcome, and that the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ.

II.—THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, embracing a View of the Origin, Progress, and Principles of the Religious Reformation which he Advocated. By ROBERT RICHARDSON. Vol. I. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1868.

Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch; Delivered before the Morning Class of Bethany College, during the Sessions of 1859–60, by ALEXANDER CAMPBELL. Also, Short Extracts from his Sermons during the same Session. Reported by CHAS. V. SEGAR, phonographer. To which is prefixed a Brief Sketch of President Campbell's Life. The whole edited, with an Introduction and Occasional Notes, by W. T. MOORE. Cincinnati: H. S. Bosworth. 1867.

WHEN God selects men to do his work he goes not among princes, nor among the aristocracy, nor among the highly favored of earth, but rising above the thoughts of men and the ways of men, he passes entirely beyond the tall and robust sons of Jesse, and chooses an obscure shepherd boy, like the noble-hearted and unsophisticated David, and, setting him before the people, he proclaims, *This is the man; anoint him.* God selects no cracked vessel in which to bear the incense of truth. He selects no man that can be bought with thirty pieces of silver. He picks men who can stand the test of fire. That man is a genius, and an elect minister of God, who, despite the trappings of glittering greatness, and without leaning on the blue blood of princely descent, and despite the patronage of plumed patricians, by means of the innate power of greatness and sanctified humanity, rises so high above the clouds of human strife, and pushes so far beyond the limits of worldly ambition, that no word of calumny can tarnish his fair fame, no envious heart can asperse his translucent life, no intelligent mind dare doubt the purity of his motive. We judge of the merits of men by what they have accomplished—not by their pretenses and brilliant parts. Many men have earned fame, but they have produced no grand results. They have made a noise in the world, but it was the noise of bluster and parade. By tricks of diplomacy and cunning device, which passes as patented greatness, mountebanks extort the praises of their fellows, and unstintingly receive the adulations of whipped-in fools. Many men have produced light, but none heat. They enlighten,

but they love not. They have struck off scintillations of genius and greatness from the golden wedge of love and truth, but the wedge itself they have never driven into the hearts of the people. They have traversed extended territories of truth and philosophy, but no vestiges of created good have they left behind as memorials of departed worth. Pretended regenerators of society have rolled in wealth, have lived in ease and magnificence, and have bestowed munificent gifts upon aristocratic establishments; but their riches and their greatness have been the poverty of the world.

Individualism is a marked feature in the development of modern society. Organized ecclesiasticism stands still and inoperative in the presence of the individual revolutionist. Centralized despotism melts away under the burning words of the approaching reformer. Organism may collect, but it is the individual that must distribute. Organisms become stagnant pools of disease and death, unless some disturber of the peaceful pool makes a *crevassé* and lets the water flow outward and downward. Individualism is the first mark of greatness. The man who moves the world is distinguished as idiosyncratic, because he drags himself and the people out of the deep grooves of supineness, and lassitude, and moral degradation. He moves in an orbit of his own—in an orbit where God placed him. Destiny drives that man forward; but he is neither influenced by motives of selfish expediency, nor is he actuated by considerations of worldly gain. He pushes right on, and all men gaze, and gape, and wonder at his marvelous success; he awaits not the appearance of a sluggish army; he tarries not for the adjustment of human organizations, nor wastes his time with mercenary combinations; he hesitates not till all men get ready; he consults not the horoscope of State policy, nor listens long to the pronounced oracles of a superstitious Church; but enthused with a high and glorious ambition, incited by the motive of effecting the greatest good for the greatest number, sworn to do right and to disobey wrong, pledged to protect and guide the innocent and to expose the guilty, and anointed to preach the glad tidings of salvation to the poor as the crowning jewel of all Christian graces, with the unalterable purpose of serving God, he pushes right on, overleaping the common obstacles of life, mounting every day to a higher degree of eminence, and despising alike the seductions of vice and the flatteries of

human praise, he finally stands high in the heavens, a crowned conqueror over all his foes! Hence, we say,

> "The fame that a man wins himself is best;
> That he may call his own: honors put on him
> Make him no more a man than his clothes do,
> Which are as soon ta'en off; for in the warmth
> The heat comes from the body, not the weeds;
> So man's true fame must strike from his own deeds."

Alexander Campbell landed in the city of New York, in the month of October, 1809—just sixty years ago. He was then twenty-three years of age. His birthplace was near Shane Castle, in the County of Antrim, Northern Ireland. His mother's ancestors were French Huguenots, who, having fled from their native country upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV, sought refuge, it appears, first in Scotland, whence they subsequently migrated to Ireland. As Nature fitted his body for endurance, and his brain for intense thought, so Providence directed his energies to inaugurate the grandest Reformation of modern days—no less than the destruction of sectarianism, simultaneous with the *restoration* of the Primitive Gospel. No unbiased mind can fail to see now, since the revered subject of this sketch has gone to his great reward, that throughout his wonderful and eventful life he was the hero of a special guiding Providence. All the surroundings of his birth, all the associations of his early life, all the social, religious, and political peculiarities of the age in which he received his first impressions, prepared his massive mind and energized his great soul for the great mental conflict of the nineteenth century. Favored with strong natural endowments, without which he never could have passed through the ordeal to which he was subjected for half a century; blessed with a father of the profoundest piety, of the finest scholastic attainments, a rare disciplinarian, and whose reverence for the Word of God was much more than ordinary; instructed and cherished by a fond and affectionate mother—in whose veins flowed the blood of the brave Huguenot defenders of the faith—and whose soul was constantly ablaze with the love of God, and all of whose powers were consecrated to the Lord of Glory, and all of whose beautiful life was but the sweet-scented unfoldings of one grand and noble purpose—the education of her children for the skies—surely the world might justly antici-

pate the great things wrought by Alexander Campbell, and the mighty achievements gained by that illustrious soldier of the Cross. His first religious impressions, while yet but a youth, and while, according to his father's ardent desire, he contemplated entering into the ministry, and while, too, he was engaged in the study of theology and ecclesiastical history, are thus briefly but comprehensively portrayed in the *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, by the facile pen of Professor Richardson:

"While thus engaged he was filled with wonder at the strange fortunes of Christianity, and at the numerous divisions or parties in religious society. He found the Catholics, numerous in his own country, for the most part an ignorant, priest-ridden, superstitious people, crushed, as it were, to the earth, as well by their own voluntary submission to an unrestricted spiritual despotism, as by the pressure of the social and political burdens resting upon them, and which were esteemed by the Protestant and Anglo-Saxon part of the population as necessary safeguards against the repetition of such abuses of power as had occurred during the rule of James the Second, and his deputy, Tyrconnel. The young student, in contemplating the whole system of Romanism in its superstitions, its ceremonies, its spirit and practical effects, conceived for it the utmost abhorrence—a feeling which remained with him through life. On the other hand, the lordly and aristocratic Episcopalians, who looked down upon the dissenters, and seemed, with some exceptions, to have but little piety, and too fond of enjoying the pleasures, fashions, and follies of the world, were, notwithstanding their Protestantism, scarcely less disliked as a religious party. It was, however, when he came to consider the history of the Presbyterian Church, with its numerous divisions, in one of which he was himself a member, that he was enabled to form a clearer conception of the power and prevalency of that party spirit which it became afterward the labor of his life to oppose and overthrow."

Alexander Campbell was born and reared in a latitude where religious sects were numerous, manifesting much bitterness and hostility, and amid which sectarian scenes he early began to note the wide difference between mere groveling sectaries, and noble, pure-minded Christians. He breathed the atmosphere where flourished such Church dignitaries as Rowland Hill, the godly Haldanes, Alexander Carson, John Walker, besides other distinguished preachers who stood identified with Independency—the fundamental principle of which was the right of private judgment, the right of every member to judge for himself as to the meaning of Scripture, repudiating, also, the authority of Presbyteries, Synods, Assemblies, Conventions, and other Church Courts, and adopting a congregational form of government. These singular phases of the religion

of those days the youthful Campbell watched with an eager eye, and contemplated with great seriousness. While at the University of Glasgow, he studied Greek under the learned Professor Young; took lessons in Logic and Belles-Lettres under Professor Jardine; and also studied Experimental Philosophy in Dr. Ure's class, besides attending to Latin and French, and to English reading and composition, during which time he retired to bed at ten o'clock, P. M., and rose regularly at four in the morning.

"Professors Young and Jardine had been his father's teachers upward of twenty-five years before, and been also favorite professors with the poet Campbell, who had finished his course at Glasgow, his native city, in May, 1796, and who speaks of Jardine in his letters, as the 'amiable,' the 'benign,' the 'philosophic Jardine.' Professor Young, too, the profound grammarian and master of elocution, had taken great interest in the youthful poet, and used to read to his class, with enthusiasm, the elegant metrical versions of the Greek poets presented by his pupil, which constantly received the highest prizes. With these and other renowned professors, Alexander was greatly pleased, and the devoted attention which he gave to their instructions is amply attested by the large number of closely written volumes which he filled during the session with copious notes of their lectures, and with his own translations from the Iliad of Homer, the Œdipus Tyrannus of Sophocles, etc., together with numerous essays and exercises in prose and verse, handed in to the professors in his various classes as regular exercises." *

As we are anxious that our religious contemporaries should know the very incipiency of the plea the disciples of Christ are making in favor of an entire *restoration* of the Apostolic Gospel, with which plea Alexander Campbell stood identified as the acknowledged leader; and, also, that they, and all whom it may concern, may know the peculiar and providential circumstances in the midst of which that thought germinated—unconsciously to the great reformer of the nineteenth century—the full unfolding and spreading of which are now apparent throughout the wide borders of sectariandom, we subjoin another pictured paragraph from the tenth chapter of this same volume:

"The power of surrounding circumstances," says the gifted biographer, "to mold human character is familiar to all, and it is one of the most interesting points in the lives of those who have become distinguished in any particular field of labor to note the methods by which Divine Providence has thus often prepared their hearts and minds for the sphere for which they were designed, and changed or modified their own purposes and plans until these were in harmony with their appointed life-work. It was, as formerly stated, the cherished desire of Thomas

* "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," pp. 131–2.

Campbell that his son Alexander should become a minister of the Gospel in the Seceder denomination, to which he belonged; and in this arrangement Alexander seems to have acquiesced, rather from respect to his father's wishes than from any original purpose of his own. It was not until he encountered the perils of the shipwreck that, as formerly stated, he finally resolved, from his own convictions of duty, to devote himself to the ministry, in pursuance of which determination he was now attending his preliminary course at the University. Thus far every thing seemed tending toward the end so much desired by Thomas Campbell, who, having received intelligence of the shipwreck, [Thomas having emigrated to America two years in advance of Alexander,] and the consequent delay of the family at Glasgow, had written to them a letter full of affectionate solicitude and consolation, and highly commending all their proposed arrangements. But Alexander's stay at Glasgow, while it left his main purpose unaltered, was destined to work an entire revolution in his views and feelings in respect to the existing denominations, and to disengage his sympathies entirely from the Seceder denomination and every other form of Presbyterianism. This change seems to have been occasioned chiefly through his intimacy with Greville Ewing. This gentleman seemed to take special interest in Alexander and in the family, and performed so many kind offices in their behalf that he became greatly endeared to them. Alexander was frequently at Mr. Ewing's to dinner or tea, where he formed many agreeable intimacies with the guests at his hospitable board, and acquired, during this intercourse, an intimate knowledge of Mr. Ewing's previous religious history, and that of his coadjutors, the Haldanes, and others. As the facts thus presented to Mr. Campbell produced a lasting effect upon his mind, it will be necessary to present a brief sketch of them, and of the eminent men concerned in the reformatory movement then progressing in Scotland—a movement from which Mr. Campbell received his first impulse as a religious reformer, and which may be justly regarded, indeed, as the *first phase* of that religious reformation which he subsequently carried out so successfully to its legitimate issues."

The religious movement of the Haldanes alluded to in the above paragraphs, and in which the magnanimous and erudite Ewing placed his life and fortune, was, in Scotland, essentially the same in principles as the religious movement in America, of which, by common consent, Alexander Campbell became the agitator. It will be seen, by the foregoing citations of history, of which, for want of space, we can only give a few of the many incidents connected with the early life of our subject, that no young man ever enjoyed greater privileges for improvement, nor stood associated with a more renowned class of men, than Mr. Campbell; and we might add, with great pertinency, that no man in modern days ever made better improvement of such privileges, nor gained greater advantages by associating with, and learning of, good and great men, nor economized and appropriated time to more glorious aims and ends than he.

Next, let us note briefly the wonderful changes that transpired in the United States soon after the young Alexander joined his father, (after a painful separation of two years,) in the town of Washington, Penn., where, in the providence of God, and we doubt not, *by the guidance of God*, the Reformation assumed organic shape, since which eventful period this vine, healthful, and vigorous, and fruitful, has overrun every sectarian wall, has lifted its fair branches in every valley, has sent its fragrance to the isles of the sea, has shot across the peaks of the highest mountains, has shed its perfume at the door of the lowliest hut, has blown its sweetest blossoms in the green gardens of the great.

Thomas Campbell, when he settled in Washington, Penn., connected himself with the Presbytery of Chartiers, but which connection he soon dissolved, because of the misrepresentation and positive persecution he received at the hands of his ministerial brethren of the Seceder Church; which evil treatment was occasioned because of the high ground taken by the generous-hearted Thomas Campbell in favor of Christian liberty and Christian union, and also declaring, in the most unequivocal terms, that the Bible should be his only rule of faith and practice. By planting himself upon a basis as broad and catholic as this, he subjected himself to the jealousy of the narrow-minded and illiberal clergy, and, in consequence of illiberality, he is made to stand a trial in the presence of the so-called Presbytery. He appeals to the Synod, which grave body, in their solemn deliberations, revoked the decision of the Presbytery, but with certain equivocal explanations. After enduring hostility and espionage for a considerable length of time, and after being fully convinced that his motives were not at all appreciated by the very persons he sought to benefit, he felt bound to forever abandon the Seceder Church, in which he was educated, and among whose people he had lived in the closest intimacy from childhood. From this time forward he strikes for Christian union in opposition to partyism and party platforms. He goes to work to define the principle of Christian union, declares in favor of religious emancipation, and forms a "society"—*not* a Church—for the promotion of simple evangelical Christianity.

It was but a short time after these events transpired that Thomas Campbell prepared his "*Declaration and Address*"—the most remarkable production that was ever penned by human instrumentality.

If he had never accomplished any thing else, this alone was sufficient to immortalize his name, which immortality he now enjoys as justly as that which rests upon the brow of Luther, who, in 1517, in opposition to superstitious dogmas and Papal usurpations, posted on the door of the Church at Wittemberg his ninety-five Theses. As these wonderful Theses of Martin Luther have never ceased to agitate the religious world, nor to disturb the fancied security of clerical despotisms, so shall the "*Declaration and Address*" of Thomas Campbell never cease to enlighten the public mind on individual right and liberty, nor cease to call good men and women from sectarian slavery to the liberty of the children of God. Alexander, on hearing the proof-sheets of this powerful document read by his father, at once adopted it, entered into the full spirit of its contents, and in after life consecrated all his noble powers to the advocacy of the evangelical principles it contained. Like Luther and Wesley, neither Thomas nor Alexander Campbell contemplated the formation of a new party, a distinct Church organization—they only aimed to suppress a bigoted, sectarian spirit in the Presbyterian Church, to rectify theological blunders as fostered in that body, and to produce a co-operation of all evangelical Christians in every good work. For publishing these Bible principles, the elder Campbell suffered reproach, and contumely, and defamation of the meanest type. After having abandoned "all ministerial connection" with the Synod as an authoritative body, and boldly announcing that henceforth he should be "utterly unaffected by its decisions," he continued to preach with great acceptance to large numbers of the most intelligent and liberal-minded people in that community, who, also, having become disgusted with the evils of sectarianism, now gladly rallied about this renowned advocate of reform. As soon as the paper containing the *Declaration and Address* was ready, the distinguished author announced a special meeting, in order that he might present a lucid and distinct statement of the principles of a proposed reformation, which the times and the circumstances imperatively seemed to demand.

"The time appointed having arrived, there was a very general assembling at the place designated. All seemed to feel the importance of the occasion, and to realize the responsibilities of their position. A deep feeling of solemnity pervaded the assembly when Thomas Campbell, having opened the meeting in the usual manner,

and, in earnest prayer, specially invoked the Divine guidance, proceeded to rehearse the matter from the beginning, and to dwell with unusual force upon the manifold evils resulting from the divisions in religious society—divisions which, he urged, were as unnecessary as they were injurious, since God had provided, in his Sacred Word, an infallible standard, which was all-sufficient, and alone sufficient, as a basis of union and Christian co-operation. He showed, however, that men had not been satisfied with its teachings, but had gone outside of the Bible, to frame for themselves religious theories, opinions, and speculations, which were the real occasions of the unhappy controversies and strifes which had so long desolated the religious world. He therefore insisted, with great earnestness, upon the return to the simple teachings of the Scriptures, and upon the entire abandonment of every thing in religion for which there could not be produced a Divine warrant. Finally, after having again and again reviewed the ground they occupied in the reformation, which they felt it their duty to urge upon religious society, he went on to announce, in the most simple and emphatic terms, the great principle or rule upon which he understood they were then acting, and upon which he trusted they would continue to act, consistently and perseveringly, to the end. 'That rule, my highly respected hearers,' said he, in conclusion, is this: that 'WHERE THE SCRIPTURES SPEAK, WE SPEAK; AND WHERE THE SCRIPTURES ARE SILENT, WE ARE SILENT.'

"Upon this annunciation a solemn silence pervaded the assembly. Never before had religious duty been presented to them in so simple a form. Never before had the great principle on which this religious enterprise rested been so clearly presented to their minds. It was to many of them as a new revelation, and those simple words, which embodied a rule so decisive of all religious strifes and of all distressing doubts, were forever engraven upon their hearts. Henceforth, the plain and simple teaching of the Word of God itself was to be their guide. God himself should speak to them, and they should receive and repeat his words alone. No remote inferences, no fanciful interpretations, no religious theories of any kind were to be allowed to alter or pervert its obvious meaning. Having God's Word in their possession, they must speak it faithfully. There should be no contention, henceforth, in regard to the opinions of men, however wise or learned. Whatever private opinions might be entertained upon matters not clearly revealed must be retained in silence, and no effort must be made to impose them upon others. Thus, the *silence* of the Bible was to be respected equally with its revelations, which were by Divine authority declared to be able to 'make the man of God perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good work.' Any thing more, then, must be an incumbrance. Any thing else than 'the whole counsel of God' would be a dangerous deficiency. Simply, reverentially, confidingly, they would speak of Bible things in Bible words, adding nothing thereto and omitting nothing given by Inspiration. They had thus a clear and well-defined basis of action, and the hearts of all who were truly interested re-echoed the resolve, '*Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.*' It was from the moment when these significant words were uttered and accepted that the more intelligent afterward dated the *formal and actual commencement of the Reformation*, which was subsequently carried on with so much success, and which has already produced such important changes in religious society over a large portion of the world." *

* "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," Chap. xiii.

Here we date the beginning of the wonderful career of Alexander Campbell. From this time forth he becomes the great defender of the faith. When Alexander heard read the "*Declaration and Address*," he predicted, at that remote day, that the principles contained in that document would thoroughly revolutionize the public mind, affirming that, "in the *Bible alone*, you will never find infant baptism, and some other things practiced by us. The restoration of Primitive Christianity will work a mighty revolution." The avowed object of this very intellectual and comprehensive document, as presented by Thomas Campbell, was "*the restoration of pure*, Primitive, Apostolic Christianity, in letter and spirit, in principle and practice." In order to carry out more effectively the principles of the Declaration, "The Christian Association of Washington" was formed. In harmony, therefore, with the published sentiments of the Declaration, a society of Christians was formed—not to be regarded as a Church—for the promotion of Christian union, and to induce a "pure evangelical reformation, by the simple preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of its ordinances in exact conformity to the Divine standard."

"There are few, in fact, of the present generation, who have grown up under the liberalizing institutions of the United States, and the more enlightened views of Christianity since presented, who can form a proper idea of the virulence of the party spirit which then prevailed. Each party strove for supremacy, and maintained its peculiarities with a zeal as ardent and persecuting as the laws of the land and the usages of society would permit. The distinguishing tenets of each party were constantly thundered from every pulpit, and any departure from the 'traditions of the elders' was visited at once with the severest ecclesiastical censure. Covenanting, Church politics, Church psalmody, hyper-Calvinistic questions were the great topics of the day; and such was the rigid, uncompromising spirit prevailing, that the most trivial things would produce a schism, so that the old members were known to break off from their congregations, simply because the clerk presumed to give out, before singing, *two* lines of a psalm instead of *one*, as had been the usual custom. Against this slavish subjection to custom, and to opinions and regulations that were merely of human origin, Mr. Campbell had long felt it his duty to protest, and knowing no remedy for the sad condition of affairs existing, except in a simple return to the plain teachings of the Bible as alone authoritative and binding upon the conscience, he, and those associated with him, felt it incumbent upon them to urge this upon religious society. This they endeavored to do in a spirit of moderation of Christian love, hoping that the overture would be accepted by the religious communities around, especially by those of the Presbyterian order, whose differences were, in themselves, so trivial. In regard to the basis of Christian union as defined in the Address, to which frequent reference has been made, so conclusive and overwhelming were the arguments

presented, and 'so fully and so kindly was every possible objection considered and refuted, that *no attempt was ever made by the opposers of the proposed movement to controvert directly a single position which it contained.*'" *

Alexander Campbell delivered his first sermon in America at Brush Run, Washington county, Penn., in the month of May, 1810. His text upon that occasion was from the closing of the Savior's sermon on the Mount, beginning with these words: "Therefore, every one that heareth these sayings of mine," etc. The entire audience was electrified by the analytic powers and burning eloquence of this new advocate of reform, and the people departed perfectly captivated by his apparent candor and fearlessness. His fame soon extended far and wide, and the excitement to hear the powerful pleader became intense. When Mr. Campbell preached his sermon, his father and James Foster were the only official ministers of the Gospel recognized in the movement for reform, and the two small churches, located respectively at Cross-Roads and Brush Run, were the only ones which stood identified with these new reformers. Out of such small beginnings does Providence evoke the grandest results. Mr. Campbell's reverence for the Word of God, his critical examinations of the plan of redemption, and his determination to take nothing but the Oracles of God for his rule of faith and practice, as well as his renunciation of sectarian dogmatisms, led him, by degrees, to restore and observe the Communion on every Lord's day, as in primitive times; to discard infant baptism for want of Scriptural evidence; to reject the Papal dogma of sprinkling, also for the same reason: these corrections he made, and others equally important, which we shall yet mention, while as yet his little band of brethren were unknown to the world, at a time when his party were in a fearful minority, without prestige, without power, and without the hope of worldly gain. But the Lord bestowed upon those brave defenders of the faith grace and glory, and no good thing did he withhold from them.

Alexander Campbell had thoroughly mastered the contents of his father's Address, as is abundantly made manifest in such utterances as the following:

"That—in order to Church union and communion—nothing ought to be inculcated upon Christians as articles of faith, nor required of them as terms of com-

* "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," p. 245.

munion, but what is expressly taught and enjoined upon them in the Word of God. Nor ought any thing to be admitted, as Divine obligation, in their Church constitution and management, but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles upon the New Testament Church; either in expressed terms, or by approved precedent."

It must not be supposed that Thomas and Alexander Campbell abandoned their old associations without a struggle, and that they entered upon this reformatory movement with alacrity and delight. Their mental conflicts were many and severe. It was not until they studied the Word of God devoutly and conscientiously, with a view of arriving at the truth, and not until they had examined every feature of the proposed reformation with a scrutinizing eye, that they embarked in the glorious enterprise for a life-work, meanwhile looking to God for guidance and wisdom. It was a sore struggle for the elder Campbell to give up sprinkling, besides some other unscriptural practices, but the principles of his own masterly Address compelled him to follow the light of God's Word. After having fully satisfied themselves that there was no authority whatever for infant baptism, and also that none but believers were commanded to be immersed, a meeting was appointed, which lasted *seven hours*, when both Thomas and Alexander Campbell reviewed the entire ground of baptism *in extenso*, presenting in full the reasons which had determined their course. It was in the month of June, 1812, that Alexander Campbell and his wife, his father and mother, and his sister, together with Mr. Hanen and his wife, were immersed in the waters of Buffalo Creek by Mr. Luce.

In the course of a few years, subsequent to this event, some five or six congregations sprung up in Washington County, Pennsylvania, and the adjacent part of Virginia; and about the year 1815 these congregations conjointly applied for admission into the Red Stone Baptist Association, and were received, with the explicit understanding that they shall not be obliged to subscribe to any human creed or confession of faith, but that they be held amenable alone to the Word of God, in all things pertaining to faith and practice. Their connection with this Association excited the jealousy and malice of the Baptist clergy, who, from time to time, spared no pains in disparaging the ability and influence of the Campbells, and who continued to oppose their noble efforts, in such a way as only bigoted priests can understand, until finally these feeble Churches, out of self-respect,

withdrew from the Red Stone Association, and at once united with the Mahoning Association, which was known to possess a more generous spirit. It was while Mr. Campbell was connected with the Red Stone Association that he delivered his famous *Sermon on the Law*, in which he ran a parallel between the Law and the Gospel, between the nature and design of the Mosaic dispensation and the Christian dispensation, and which, on account of the high-toned Scriptural principles the sermon contained, excited a terrible commotion among the Baptists, and which, in a special manner, provoked the clergy to the most relentless opposition. Space will not allow us to present here the unworthy means resorted to in the Red Stone Association, on the part of the envious clergy, to bring Alexander Campbell and his congregations into disrepute, and the low artifices they employed in order to exclude the "six congregations that had come in with the Campbells." Having satisfied himself that a certain kind of parliamentarian trick was about to be sprung upon him, Alexander Campbell immediately proposed to the congregations sought to be ejected, that they peaceably and forever withdraw, and thus avoid all further strife with that Association. This proposition was concurred in by all, and before the next annual meeting they had all united with the Mahoning Association. Here they found a congenial home. Providence smiled upon them propitiously. In a few years this Association cast off all ecclesiastical power and clerical prerogatives, and substituted therefor an annual meeting of sister Churches, from which circumstances we date the origin of what is known at the present time as "big meetings," where all met then, as they meet now, without any lines of distinction, upon one common plane of Christian equality.

Here was the rising tide of the great reformation. Up to this period the subject of this sketch was largely engaged in agricultural pursuits, for which he had both taste and aptness, and in which pursuit he was exceedingly prospered; but now he enters into the field evangelical with all the force of his native abilities, and responding to Macedonian calls in every direction, he buckles on the armor of God, and without the fear or favor of man, sounds out the Word of the Lord and proclaims the day of deliverance from sacerdotal and sectarian bondage. His first utterances fell like divine oracles, as when, for instance, he declared that "*Christian unity can result from*

nothing short of the destruction of creeds and confessions of faith, inasmuch as human creeds and confessions have destroyed Christian unity;" and that "*whenever the setting aside of creeds and confessions shall be attempted, Christians will give to the world, and to angels, and to themselves, proof that they do believe the Word of God.*" Advocating such provoking principles, boldly challenging investigation upon the Word of God, despising all worldly honor, and courting the applause of no ecclesiastical court, Alexander Campbell, early in life, became the recognized champion of an aggressive party, the vindicator of a principle which in fifty years should turn the ecclesiastical world upside down.

Behold, now, the life-work of fifty years! Did mortal man ever achieve more in the same length of time? On what page of Church history will you find a brighter record? Mark, in the sequel, the grand results of a long and eventful life wholly consecrated to the service of God. As Luther, in his day, restored to *the people the key of Bible knowledge*, so Campbell, in his day, put into the hands of the people the *key of Bible interpretation.* Let any one read that masterly production, entitled the "Christian System," in which is found a systematic delineation of the nature and design of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations, and a grand and sublime portraiture of the Moral Government of God, if he wants to be captivated by, and fall in love with, the glorious scheme of redemption, which, on the sparkling pages of that beautiful book, is made so perspicuous, and rendered so convincing, that he who runs may read and comprehend. Luther announced the joyful news that the Bible belonged to the people; Campbell has demonstrated the fact that man can make the Bible its own interpreter, by faithfully and sincerely studying its contents.

In 1823, Mr. Campbell began his career as a journalist and a publisher, by establishing the "*Christian Baptist,*" a monthly periodical, devoted to the defense and propagation of the Apostolic Gospel. He continued this serial for seven years, but the entire work appears now in book form. The marrow and fatness of the wisdom and learning of the great polemic will be found in this work, the reading of which, from time to time, has induced thousands to abandon parties and party names, and simply to bear the exhaustless name *Christian.* For the benefit of those persons who take pleasure in repre-

senting that Campbell was an Arian or a Socinian, we here make the bold denial by alleging that sounder, grander, profounder, and more convincing arguments, on the Divinity of Christ, never were presented by human instrumentality than are found in this transcendent work. Campbell was not a controversialist from choice, as many have supposed; but in consequence of the independent position he assumed, as a faithful expounder of the Word of God, and also in consequence of his exposing error and denouncing evil of all kinds, he was necessarily provoked into many religious controversies which marked here and there the course of his busy life. In 1830 the *Christian Baptist* was succeeded by the *Millennial Harbinger*, which he conducted, as its editor-in-chief, till the close of the year 1863.

Mr. Campbell's first public debate was with the Rev. John Walker, a minister of the Seceder Church, in the year 1820, at Mt. Pleasant, Ohio. The debate was on the action and subject of baptism. His second debate was with Rev. Wm. M'Calla, a Presbyterian clergyman, on the subject of "Christian Baptism," which occurred in 1822, in Washington, Kentucky. His third debate, in Cincinnati, in 1829, on the "*Evidences of Christianity*," with Robert Owen, the notorious skeptic, who challenged the Protestant world to defend the Bible, stands without a parallel in respect to profundity of thought, the accumulation of testimony, and the overwhelming power of the argument, his antagonist being entirely discomfited, while the friends of the Bible, without respect to party, abounded in rejoicings and thanksgivings. His fourth debate, in the same city, in 1836, was with Bishop (now Archbishop) Purcell, on the entire subject of "*Roman* Catholicism," the result of which extraordinary discussion was watched with eager eyes and bated breath throughout large portions of the United States. His fifth oral debate, held in the city of Lexington, Kentucky, in 1843, with Dr. N. L. Rice, extending through eighteen days, was unquestionably the most exhaustive of all his debates, embracing within its wide compass these absorbing subjects: "The Action, Subject, Design, and Administration of Christian Baptism;" "The Character of Spiritual Influence in Conversion and Sanctification;" and also "The Expediency and Tendency of Ecclesiastical Creeds, as Terms of Union and Communion." This debate was honored with the presence of Henry Clay as presiding moderator; and it was also upon this occasion that Henry Clay, the great

Commoner, pronounced Alexander Campbell to be the profoundest theologian of the age, the most eloquent speaker, and the most expert polemic. In addition to these oral debates, he had two written debates in the *Harbinger*, one with Bishop Semple, and one with Rev. Mr. Skinner, a prominent Universalist preacher.

"His debate with the celebrated Owen, the zealous and talented propagandist of Infidel sociology, deserves additional notice. Owen published a challenge to the clergy of the whole country to meet him in debate on his peculiar belief. He put it forth in New Orleans, and no one dared or cared to take it up. Finally, it fell under the eye of Alexander Campbell, and he at once resolved to accept it. Speaking of this challenge he says, 'I have long wondered why none of the public teachers of Christianity have appeared in defense of the "last, best hope of mortal man." I have felt indignant at the aspect of things in reference to this libertine and lawless scheme, and relying on the author, the reasonableness, and the excellency of the Christian religion, I will meet him in debate.' This, as well as the discussion with Archbishop Purcell, was a labor which Mr. Campbell felt he owed to Christendom. They were, in no exclusive sense, connected with the special work of reformation to which he was more particularly devoted. His important defense of the truth of Christianity against the Infidel attacks of Owen, and his even greater vindication of Protestantism against Romanism, deserve the gratitude of the Christian world. He stood, in both of these conflicts, as the champion of evangelical truth, and his overwhelming assaults upon these two decided foes of pure Christianity will ever be remembered as forming an era in the victories of the true Church of God." *

Up to the year 1840, the subject of this paper had made many extensive tours through many States of the Union, and, by this means, obtained much useful information in respect to the wants of the times. He had toiled unceasingly day and night, at home in his studio, abroad in the field evangelical, talking by the fireside, and pleading on the public stage, writing theses when others were asleep, and responding to letters from all parts of the globe. Thus, for many years he devoted sixteen hours per day to the cause of Christ, and for the amelioration of the human family. Alexander Campbell had now become the most eminent and successful reformer of modern times, and the horizon of his influence had widened to such an extent that he was hailed every-where as the "bright, particular star" of a mighty multitude of people, who were now ready to abandon the fields of sectarianism, and to plant themselves upon the Bible alone. Men are living yet who can testify that they walked twenty and thirty miles to hear this great defender of faith preach, and to hear him

* "Lectures on the Pentateuch," p. 31.

expound the Word of God as they had never heard it expounded before. Congregations of Disciples had been established in nearly every State in the Union. The wondrous powers of the invincible disputant attracted thousands to hear him in his magnificent generalizations. Inspired by the eloquence of the great declaimer, awakened by the intensity of the truth, charmed by the beauty and simplicity of the glorious Gospel, animated by the theme of Divine love as they never heard it before, and stirred up to the deepest depths of their souls by the grand conclusions of reason and revelation, many men became oblivious of themselves, and scores of them deserted field, and shop, and rostrum, and forum, that they, too, might preach the same glad tidings of salvation to a fallen world. Many of his coadjutors were not men of scholastic training nor of refined manners, but they were mighty in the Scriptures, and a terror to evil doers. Some of these renowned pleaders still linger among us.

In 1840, Mr. Campbell founded Bethany College, in which enterprise, in order to make sure its success and permanency, he invested largely of his own private means. From 1841 to the last day of his mortal existence, he was honored as President of this magnificent institution. To him belonged the honor and the credit of introducing, for the first time, the Bible, *as a text-book*, into an American college. It has proved a wonderful success. Three hundred graduates—many of them men of distinction and of great power—a reproduction of the presiding genius of Bethany College—scattered throughout the civilized world, can bear testimony to the infinite value and profound pleasure of the Bible Lectures delivered at the "morning lesson," year in and year out. Let any one read the work before us, entitled *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, if he desires to get an idea of the nature and import of those transcendent expositions of Scripture, and to form some estimate of the Divine philosophy and the amazing philanthropy of the plan of redemption as elucidated by the learned expositor. This enterprise the President had cherished for many years—it was the dream of his life; it was the consummation of his earthly ambition—a sacred spot where he could educate a ministry in harmony with the doctrine of the Bible, and to meet the wants of the age. Most ample was his reward before he passed away. Some of the graduates of Bethany College are presidents and professors in other colleges, resting upon the same

Bible foundation, teaching the same things, and reproducing men of the same invincible spirit, who have gone forth by hundreds to do battle for the Lord. Some have become eminent as writers and journalists, and stand at the head of the profession. Others are proclaiming the ancient Gospel beyond the mountains of the East, and over the wide prairies of the West, and beyond the savannas of the South, and not a few have penetrated to the far-off isles of the sea, whose voices re-echo the victories of the Cross.

Alexander Campbell would have excelled as a statesman, but he chose rather to serve God than Cæsar. In the winter of 1829–30 he served as a member of the convention which met in Richmond to amend the Constitution of the State of Virginia, and while serving in that capacity he associated with such intellectual giants as ex-President Madison, Chief-Justice Marshall, John Randolph, of Roanoake, and Philip Doddridge. He would have excelled as a *litterateur*. His popular addresses before different colleges and literary associations present the most indubitable evidence that he not only understood the law of Moses, and was versed in the wisdom of Solomon, but that he was fully conversant with the times of Cicero and Demosthenes, as well as with all the literary characters of the days of Ben Jonson, to say nothing of his intimate acquaintance with the *illuminati* of modern times.

It may be pertinent, in this connection, to raise the question, In what respects have Mr. Campbell and his coadjutors improved upon Christianity as they found it? We answer, briefly:

1. In the adjudication of every controverted, Scriptural question their appeal is "To the Law and to the Testimony."

2. In matters of faith and obedience, they discriminate between fact and opinion. The order of the Gospel is this: we receive and believe the facts of the Gospel; we obey the commands of the Gospel; we enjoy the promises of the Gospel. Opinions are to be held as private property; they never must be made a test of Christian fellowship, nor be imposed on any one as necessary to an admittance into the body of Christ.

3. They accept the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice, rejecting all human creeds as divisive of the Lord's people, and repudiating all denominational platforms as being entirely subversive of the Apostolic order of things.

4. They contend for the Scriptural identification of the Church of Christ, maintaining that to call the Church of Christ the *Methodist* Church, or the *Baptist* Church, or the *Presbyterian* Church, and so on, is an open insult to the authority of Him who is the head of the "One Body."

5. They reject infant baptism and sprinkling as outgrowths of Papal usurpation, and maintain that immersion is the "one baptism" set forth in the New Testament, and that, according to the original Greek, it is the exclusive mode.

6. They positively assert, by the authority of inspired teaching, that "*the Gospel is the power of God* in order to salvation," and deny, because of the total absence of evidence, that, in conversion, God exerts a special and direct influence above and beyond the Word of God in regenerating the hearts of sinners. They teach that "the Word of God is the seed of the Kingdom;" that the life-imparting power of the Gospel is found in the Word of Truth; and that it is "*the law* of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus that makes us free." Consequently, they go straight against "experiences," and "special revelations," and "dreams," and "vain imaginations," and phantasms generally, as only serving the purpose of mystifying the entire Scheme of Redemption. They are also stoutly opposed to the conceit that a certain *state of feelings*, superinduced by a super-excited imagination, must be received as an evidence of pardon, instead of *the evidence* of God's Word.

7. They teach, and with special emphasis, that the minister of the Gospel should explain Bible things and thoughts in Bible phraseology, discarding all scholastic terms and all theological technicalities, as only serving to bewilder, instead of enlightening, the common mind.

8. The great thought of Mr. Campbell's life, toward which he bent all his energies, was, as it is now, the controlling thought of the Disciples of Christ, the union of all Christians—not upon a sectarian platform, not upon a "denominational" basis, but upon the exclusive teaching of Christ and his Apostles. They plead not for the union of God's people in some great reformer, but *in Christ*, as head over all things to the Church, which is his body. This plea for union has been savagely opposed by the clergy of all denominations, because they well know that if the contemplated union should be

realized, their occupation in sustaining sectarian parties would be gone. But one fact is patent to all intelligent people, which is, that there is not a religious body of people in existence, Protestant or Catholic, but what has been, and now is, more or less influenced to correct their doctrine and ecclesiastical divergencies in pursuance of the plea made by Alexander Campbell and his coadjutors.

The "Disciples of Christ"—who profess to represent the "Church of Christ"—wish it distinctly understood that their plea is not merely an effort to *reform* the ecclesiastical establishments of the day, but a plea that contemplates an entire *restoration* of the Apostolic order of things. The grand results of this plea—results, which, in the same space of time, stand unparalleled in the history of the Church, since the second century—may be summed up briefly as follows:

They count a membership of at least 500,000 communicants, many thousands of whom, by the process of disintegration, have abandoned the various religious denominations of the day. And though they possess and control but few organized missionary societies, these figures show conclusively that, by some means or other, they have proved themselves the most successful missionary people in the world, these results having been gained within fifty years.

They control twelve chartered colleges, a number of female seminaries, and one mammoth university, located on the Henry Clay estate, and embracing within itself six distinct colleges, the enterprise being placed on a scale of magnificence unequaled by any thing of the kind in the United States, or even in Europe; and which, at the present time, is educating nearly eight hundred students.

They own, as individual enterprises, some twenty-five periodicals, embracing one quarterly, five or six monthlies, six or seven weeklies, two ladies' magazines, and several Sunday school papers.

They number about 2,000 congregations, with about 1,000 regular preachers, many of whom rank high as pulpit orators, as forcible and popular writers, and as distinguished polemics.

The work of Alexander Campbell just now begins to be approved and appreciated by the intelligent and honest-hearted of the religious world. The fact now comes to be acknowledged that he was pre-eminently a defender of the faith, although during his long, toilsome lifetime he was grossly misrepresented and calumniated. Though repeatedly stigmatized as an Arian, a Socinian, a heretic,

and as denying the work of the Holy Spirit, the fact becomes more apparent every day, that no man, since the days of the Apostles, has wielded such a powerful influence in the correction of theological errors and in the re-establishment of the Apostolic order of things. No one has done more to make the Bible a plain book, and the book of the people; no one has more ably defended the Sacred Volume against the attacks of Infidels; no one ever dealt more heavy blows against sectarian exclusiveness and ecclesiastical despotism; no one has more successfully exposed priestly arrogance, and broken down the barriers that separate the people from the clergy. By pleading for Christian union, in opposition to Protestant divisions, he incurred the spite and the bitterness of the clergy, and through the misrepresentations of the jealous clergy, he suffered the censure and suspicions of the people; but now the tide begins to flow back. Christian union, among all denominations, is growing into the most popular theme of the day, for the agitation of which subject Mr. Campbell suffered reproach and contumely. As another result of his plea in favor of the one Apostolic baptism, we may fairly estimate that, comparing the present with fifty years ago, the number of persons immersed stand in the proportion of one hundred to one. One hundred voices speak union now where there used to be but one voice. Every question is probed to the bottom. Sectarianism is losing its hold on the hearts of the people. Thousands are seeking for the old paths. Distinctions between clergy and people are melting away. The motto of intelligent and honest men is, "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good." Denominational creeds are no longer regarded as binding on Church communicants. The decrees of synods and councils are buried in the same grave with the fossils of antique superstition. The preacher who mounts the pulpit must prove his proposition, or meet the reprobation of an inquiring people.

With this array of testimony and these marks of progress before us, who dare say that Alexander Campbell, as an instrument in the hands of God, has not left an ineffaceable impress of his great mind upon this wonderful age, and energized with the great powers of his soul the best men and women of our generation, in whose hands he has left the rich heritage of consummating the grandest reformation of modern days!

III.—ANCIENT HYMNODY.

WE propose, in the present number, to give a hasty sketch of the origin and nature of the hymns of the Old and New Testament Scriptures; and also those of the early ages of what may be called the Primitive Church. In some subsequent paper we shall endeavor to treat upon the Medieval and Modern Hymnody, reaching down to the present time. We feel how difficult it is to do justice to a subject of such breadth and importance, and to work up, within our limited space, the ample materials which the hymns of the ages have furnished.

All earnest minds have sought to give expression to their deepest thoughts and passions in poetry. This is the truest and most permanent utterance of the soul. Poetry is the language of the imagination, the only creative faculty we possess. Much of the Bible is written in this language, instead of plain and simple narrative. God is in love with the beautiful. Creation is saturated with it. Each orb that fills its appointed place is a grand epic; and suns and systems an oratorio,

> "Forever singing as they shine,
> The hand that made us is divine."

The cold and formal deductions of the intellect, the elaborately-defined system of the theologian, are wholly unfit to offer in praise to the God of glory. What to him is our logical analysis, our metaphysical reasonings, our "divine alchemy"? When we approach God we should give him the richest treasures of our hearts. Nothing is fit to be offered but the firstlings of the flock, and the finest in the field. When we come into his sanctuary, the oil of the lamps must be crushed out of the ripened olives, pure and unadulterated; and the incense of prayer and praise must be made up from the choicest products of the human heart, interpenetrated with the fires of the golden altar of the holy place.

In the Bible God has spoken to man in the selectest forms of human speech. He has winged the arrows of truth with the

plumage of heaven, and sent them into the human heart to do their appointed work. He has drawn from nature and art all their wealth, to captivate the imagination, to inform the judgment, and to quicken the conscience. It is in the spirit of this oracular form of speech that psalmody has its true origin. It is the voice of the spirit of man in its highest moods and richest utterances, addressing itself to the ear of God. It is the soul bringing itself into the sweetest, tenderest, dearest relationship to its Maker. It is the "melody of the heart," whatever may be the discord of the lips; and he who searches the heart, and knows the disposition of the spirit, can fully interpret and understand it. It is the reaching of the spirit upward to the Infinite in its immortal longings and heavenward aspirations.

The Wonders of Redemption, the Blood of the Cross, the Triumphs of the Resurrection, the Glories of the Ascension, and the Mediatorial Reign, are themes that can not be excelled. They form the burden of Christian psalmody, and when the words are accompanied with the melody of sweet sounds, they melt and subdue, they raise and sublimate the affections, and fill us with adoring wonder and praise.

The psalmody of the Scriptures has enlisted in its service, indeed, all the elements of Nature. It has called to its aid Creation and Providence, as well as the marvels of Redemption; the rain and the dew, the cloud and the tempest, the shadow of the rock, and the heat of the sun; the rivulets among the hills, and the roar of the ocean; the earth and the sky; the whole animal creation; the cedars of Lebanon, and the lilies of the valley; the oaks of Bashan, and the rose of Sharon; the birds that sing among the branches, and the stormy wind fulfilling the will of God; Tabor with its snowy summit, and the little hills that rejoice on every side.

The song of angels at the advent of the Savior is the key-note to the hymnody of the New Institution—"Glory to God in the highest: on earth, peace, good-will among men." It heralded the Messianic age, which is to last forever, and was the grandest choral hitherto sung.

The notes of the advent still linger in the heavens, and have been borne down through the ages to the present time; and will continue until the trump of the resurrection morn. The Christian worshiper lives in the atmosphere of song. Its divine inspirations and harmo-

nies pervade his whole being. The ancient breath of a higher world stirs his soul, and brings him in sympathy with the elder sons of creation, "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." The very element in which the Christian lives is joy—the joy of the Lord. It is often the joy of tears, the joy of "the man of sorrows," the purest, divinest joy ever known. It is a part of that legacy Jesus left to his disciples on the earth. "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any one cheerful? let him sing praise."

The Author of our religion, who knew what was in man, has made the most ample provision for this essential part of worship. His own life was the sublimest of all epics. From the cradle to the cross, and from the cross to the throne, he has furnished materials for an inexhaustible store of lyrics, that only the genius of a Milton could but faintly appreciate, and which will more than master the most successful aspirants for fame in poetry and song. The great English poet has furnished the world with one song on the nativity, the finest in the language, which, for its simple grandeur and breadth of manner, its lofty imagination, subdued by the subject, is unsurpassed. It shows the possibilities of the mighty themes connected with the life and mission of Jesus:

"The oracles are dumb,
No voice or hideous hum
Runs through the archéd roof in words deceiving.
Apollo from his shrine
Can no more divine,
With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving.
No nightly trance or breathéd spell
Inspires the pale-eyed priest from the prophetic cell.

He feels from Juda's land
The dreaded Infant's hand.
The rays of Bethlehem blind his dusky eyn,
Nor all the gods beside,
Longer dare abide,
Nor Typhon huge ending in snaky twine:
Our Babe to show his Godhead true,
Can in his swaddling bands control the damnéd crew."

Praise constituted a great part of the religious worship, not only of the Israelites, but of all Pagan nations. In the synagogue and temple, and in their private dwellings, the Jews celebrated the

praises of God. On grand occasions their great minstrels offered to him their loftiest hymns.

The songs of the Hebrew people belong to the heroic age of the nation. They were heard in the times of the Judges, and culminated in the life and the times of David. They then began to decline, and never afterward revived. The more thoughtful and considerate character of their psalmody is identical with the peaceful epochs of their history. But its lyrical character was hushed in the midst of the commerce and trade and domestic felicity of the tribes. Ewald speaks of the latter period of their psalmody as "artificial." Now what was true in regard to Hebrew songs is equally true in regard to Christian. They both belong to the heroic, in the life of persons and of nations or communities. The more peaceful times give us the sentimental, or a large profusion of the "artificial." They are pretty, but wanting in depth; beautiful, but destitute of the sublime. They dwell much upon the daily experience, the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows of the Christian life, but having little in them robust and stirring, calling us to suffering and victory, to self-denial and triumph. It is true in regard both to Hebrew and Christian hymns, and, indeed, the hymns of a nation, that they must be personal to be heroic, and they must be heroic to live in the heart of a nation or of the world. All those hymns that speak of Christ, his birth, his baptism, his life, his cross, his triumphs, live in the hearts of his people, and are the battle-songs of his conquering armies.

It is worthy of remark, that no record is given us of any songs belonging to the antediluvian age, unless the prophetic announcement of Enoch, which looked beyond the actual scenes of Redemption, may be thus called.* The age was one of extreme wickedness. The soil was too corrupt, the atmosphere too defiled, to produce a song that would survive the Flood. Although song is born of sorrow, it is not the offspring of guilt. An age of universal corruption can not produce a lyric that will live, unless it is the product of inspiration, or the voice of injured virtue defiantly breaking the chains that bound it, and summoning to reformation. It is a phenomenon observed in the literature of all nations, that the earliest form in which the thoughts and feelings of a people find utterance is the poetic. The song antedates the birth and the history

* Jude, 14, 15.

of nations. Prose is an after-growth, less spontaneous and more considerate.

The first recorded hymn in the Bible is that which was sung on the opposite shore of the Red Sea.* It was the national thanksgiving of the tribes of Israel. When the nation appeared, which had been hidden in Egypt, her voice became audible. The song was of victory and triumph. It was "sung to the Lord." It was the first song of triumph ever heard from the lips of a nation celebrating the wonders of redemption in their behalf by the Lord of Hosts. Their enemies had sunk, like lead, to the bottom of the sea; and amidst the silence of the desert, and the deeper silence of the dead, Israel sang this song of redemption. It was the type of all the subsequent songs of the nation; and in some form it has, in every age since, been heard—sometimes in feeble accents, and again in bursts of choral triumph.

We have one book in the Scriptures which speaks from the universal heart of man to God—a book inspired of God to aid the heart in these its deepest utterances. It is the book of Psalms. "Unto thee, O Lord, will I sing." It is an inspired liturgy for all time, and the prophetic utterances of David for himself and for his "greater Son"—of a sorrow and a joy that had no equal. The book itself is a part of one great hymn of redemption, ever repeating itself in the inward struggles and hopes, repentings and confessions, prayers and praises of the Church, in its life of humiliation and suffering, till her warfare is over.

Every song written by David and others in this wondrous book was designed to give expression to some deliverance, some great sorrow, or to record some event of note in the person of its Author, or the history of the nation. The fewest, if any of them, were simply contemplative or sentimental. When David fled from Absalom, his son, his heart lifted itself up to "the Lord, his shield;" when Shimei cursed him, he sang praises to the name of the Lord Most High; looking up to the rocks and the wild hill-fortresses, among which he had taken refuge from Saul, he called on "the Lord, his fortress, and his high tower." In his youth, looking at his flocks in the desert, led by green pastures and still waters, his heart turned to "the Lord, his shepherd."

* Exod. xv.

David had his "appointed order of singers;" and some portion was "due every day." But in the Spiritual House, which, silently, day by day, is going up, each stone is musical, and when touched by the hand of the Great Master, responds in tears, and sighs, and strains of exultation and joy, which every age repeats, and to which every redeemed heart responds. Each child of God has a song of his own; but every note is in harmony with the grand oratorio. The finest strains are those which approach to the very borders of the elements of discord. For what is musical harmony but light out of darkness, and rhythm out of discord? And so "our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought."

The first hymn of the Messianic Age, by human lips, was sung by Mary, the mother of Jesus, and was only heard by one auditor—a faithful woman of Israel. "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior."* The next was sung by Zacharias, at the circumcision of John, the harbinger of Jesus. But one more was heard that finished the beautiful triad, and then silence prevailed until the night of the betrayal. The cradle and the cross, the birth and the death of the great Hero of our salvation, constitute the mighty themes of Hymnody in the mission of Jesus. These stand associated with his life of sorrow, and his final triumph. †

In the Acts of Apostles, we have one choral struck from the heart of the Church by the hand of persecution, in which all present united in giving it expression; and still another, followed by the earthquake that shook the prison at Philippi. ‡ These, with perhaps a few sentences which seem to partake of the nature of song, are all that are found in the New Testament until the Apocalyptic strains fall upon the ear.

The use of psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs is expressly enjoined by the Apostle as essential parts of Christian worship. § Songs were used in the Christian Church that seem to have been improvised for the occasion. ‖

Grotius and others have supposed that fragments of hymns, used by the Apostolic Church, may be found in the Epistles. ¶ They suppose, from the musical rhythm found in these and other verses,

* Luké i, 46–55. † Luke i, 64–75; ii, 29–32. ‡ Acts iv, 24–30; xvi, 25. § Eph. v, 19; Col. iii, 16. ‖ 1 Cor. xiv, 26. ¶ 1 Tim. iii, 16; 2 Tim. ii, 11–13; 1 Cor. xiii.

that they must have been sung; but the argument is not conclusive. Many of these passages, however, are highly poetical.

Pliny, at the close of the Apostolical Age, A. D. 103, 104, gives the earliest authoritative record on the Hymnody of the Primitive Church, in his famous letter to Trajan, in which he says "that Christians were wont to assemble before day to offer praise to Christ as to God." "*Carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem.*" Eusebius says that "Pliny could find nothing against the Christians, save that they sang hymns to Christ as to God." It would seem, then, that the Christians, in that early age, followed in the footsteps of the Apostolic Churches. Tertullian distinctly testifies to the use of songs to the praise of God by Christians in his day, and of the Apostolical Churches. "Every one," he says, "united in their public worship to sing unto God, according to his ability from the Scriptures, or *de proprio ingenio—one indited* by *himself*." Justin Martyr, also, mentions the songs and hymns of the Ephesian Christians—"we manifest our gratitude to him by worshiping him in spiritual songs and hymns, praising him for our birth, for our health, for the vicissitudes of the seasons, and for the hopes of immortality."

Eusebius has also left on record the important testimony of Caius, supposed to be an ancient historian, and contemporary with Tertullian: "Who knows not," says he, "the writings of Irenæus, Melito, and others, which exhibit Christ as God and man? And *how many songs and odes of the brethren there are* written from the beginning—*jam pridem—a long time since*, by believers, which offer praise to Christ as the Word of God?" This is an important testimony to the use of spiritual songs in Christian worship, from the remotest antiquity. There seems also in this passage to be some allusion to a collection of spiritual songs—an inchoate hymn-book—perhaps the earliest known.

Christ is the hero of most, if not all, these songs. His name and mission, his life and doctrine, his miracles and sufferings, and his final triumphs constitute, the glorious themes of Christian praise and worship.

The songs of the first Christians were not restricted to the congregation. In their social circles, and around their domestic altars, in their daily avocations, in dismal mines, in solitary prisons, and as wandering exiles, they sung the songs of Zion, and hymned the

praises of God. "Go where you will," says Jerome, "the plowman at his plow sings his joyful halleluiahs, the busy mower regales himself with his psalms, and the vine-dresser is singing one of the songs of David. Such are our songs—our love-songs—as they are called, the solace of the shepherd in his solitude, and of the husbandman in his toil." Beautiful description of the hymnody of the Primitive Church as practiced among the humbler classes of society! It would be well if the same was more generally practiced now. It would diffuse a healthier glow over the heart of the Christian, and prevent much of the *ennui* so characteristic in our days.

The Primitive Christians met on the first day of the week in honor of the Resurrection. The Jewish Sabbath was abolished, but the first day of the new creation was held sacred. This day was not so much added to the Christian institution as that it was born of it. It was its eldest child—ever to be held dear to the heart of the worshiper. It yielded its homage and its sacred memorials to the risen Savior. If the seventh day was sanctified by the typical nation, the *first* was crowned by the disciples of Christ. On this day the Christian assemblies met, "singing to each other in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in their hearts to God." It is proper that the hymnals of the Church on this blessed day should be of the highest order. The whole of our services on the Lord's Day indeed should partake of the character of song, in which all should in some manner partake. Praise should be interspersed throughout our worship. Its monotony should be frequently broken up as by a handful of diamonds scattered over the assembly. The services of the house of God should not be stereotyped, but should be, in some measure, free and spontaneous. We have no idea that, in the Apostolical Churches, such a ritualistic order was observed as is now found among us. The Apostle, in referring to the order of worship, says: "I will sing with the spirit that is given me, and I will sing with my understanding also." "When you come together each one of you has a psalm, has something to teach, has an unknown tongue, has a revelation, has an interpretation."

There has come down to us from the early Church three hymns, which have the dew and freshness of the "new creation" resting upon them. They seem to have been brought from "a field that God has blessed." The "Tersanctus," the "Gloria Excelsis," and the "Te

Deum." Through all the corruptions of the Dark Ages they have remained intact. We are not able to say when they originated, but their existence can be traced back to the earliest uninspired records of our religion. Who wrote them, or how they had their birth, whether they were suddenly brought into existence, or were the outgrowth of a century or more, we can not say. They lay entombed in dead languages for centuries, and this may have preserved them in their pristine purity. All around them the air was fetid with the corruptions of an apostate Church. Errors and rank idolatries sprang up around them—prayers to dead men, and lifeless wood, and symbolic bread, and passionate appeals to all saints. Aves and litanies to Mary were chanted by more lips than were heard in these sublime offerings to God and his Christ. But here they stand, like sentinels, guarding the ancient faith, and lifting up their solemn protest against all innovations and earth-born traditions. Like the earliest creeds of the Church, they dwell upon the great facts of our redemption. They give no place simply to feeling and sentiment; but how lofty and exulting the strains they breathe! They do not speak of our affections, but of the mighty achievements of the Captian of our salvation. Not a tone of sorrow mingles with their joy; not one sigh of despondency mars the majesty of their mighty hopes. The lamentations of the fall are silenced amid the halleluiahs of adoring saints, and mortality is swallowed up of life. "Therefore with angels and archangels, and all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory; glory be to thee, O Lord, Most High!" These hymns are chiefly addressed to Christ, and record the great facts of redemption. "O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God, the Father, have mercy on us." Thus the *Gloria* and the *Miserere* are ever associated together. The *Te Deum* crowns this glorious triad. The hymns of the Church have better conserved the faith of Christ than its creeds. The heart is more loyal to the person of the Redeemer than the head. The love-songs of the family of Christ speak

of his mighty deeds. The creeds seek to reason upon them. The generous impulses of the bride—the Lamb's wife—are truer to his nature and his work than theological athletes. She has often said, "I can not reason for Christ, but I can die for him." The former is the creed, the latter the song!

Before we speak of the hymns whose authorship is known, a few words may not be unprofitable in regard to the anonymous Greek hymns. To what precise age they belong we can not say, as the manuscripts which record them may be but copies of the more ancient; and these may have been written long after they had been sung *memoriter*. They are characterized by extreme simplicity, and, therefore, lead us to conclude that they originated in the Primitive Church. These early songs carry back our faith to the times of the Apostles. It is supposed that some of these are earlier than any that Clement of Alexandria wrote—the earliest known hymn-writer. The first of these are the "Morning and Evening Hymn," so called in Daniel's Thesaurus—the "Morning" being the well-known "Glory to God in the highest," as found in the prayer-book, the "Evening Hymn," commencing with the words,

> "Joyful light of holy glory,
> Of the immortal Heavenly Father."

The subject-matter of both these hymns is objective; but little, if any, appeal made to the imagination; no ecstasy of passion; no sentimentality; but a narration of facts; a close realization of the great events that stand associated with our faith. They are eminently personal; they are of the nature of the inspired records of our religion; they dwell upon facts which alone can awaken within us all grateful and sublime emotions. When looking out upon the earth, the ocean, or the sky, or the great facts of redemption, the moment we begin to analyze the emotions they awaken, they leave us, for they can exist no longer than the objects that awakened them are present to our senses.

The early Greek hymns dwell upon Christ—his birth, baptism, life, death, resurrection, and ascension; but chiefly upon his nativity and incarnation—the union of the Godhead with the human in his nature in the person of our Redeemer. They do not often dwell upon his death and the after-scenes of his mission. This was due

to the esthetic and sensuous character of the Greek mind in love with the beautiful, the mysterious, the sublime. They loved to look back upon the origin of things. Christ, as a restorer, was to them more precious than Christ as the Redeemer. The cradle was dearer than the Cross; the manger than the sepulcher; and, in later years, Mary than her Son! They scarcely get beyond the cradle and the incarnation in their songs. The pervading influence of these facts is seen alike in their creeds and in their songs. The Mariolatry of the later Church may be traced back to it. The Western Church learned its philosophy, and much of its religion, from the eastern portion of the Roman Empire. They made the manger the center of the faith. But the person of Christ, and his Cross, are the great central truths of the New Institution. Numerous hymns are written on the "Nativity," on Baptism, and the Resurrection. One song on the Pentecost has these words:

> "When descending, he confused the tongues;
> The Highest scattered the nations;
> *When he distributed the tongues of fire*
> *He called to unity.*"

In later times their songs become more sentimental and subjective, like those of the Middle Ages, and like many of modern times. They indicate a want of trust in the great facts of the Gospel history, and show the tendency of the mind to look within, instead of looking without, for comfort and relief, amidst the trials and temptations of life.

We have already spoken of Clement of Alexandria as the first known hymn-writer. It will not be possible for us now to trace down the stream of time the subject of hymnody until the days of Luther and the modern Church. We have neither time nor space to do so. But a few thoughts on the times of Clement, and the sources of the hymns in his day, may lead us to a fair consideration of the productions of subsequent times.

Rome still existed, and was imperial; Constantinople had its own peculiar center, and Jerusalem was still the ancient fountain of the true faith. Alexandria, a busy, flourishing city, the channel of traffic for western regions, was the busy mart of nations. It became the center of thought, whose slightest vibration was felt in every direction. Clement was called to the head of the catechetical

school in Alexandria. He had long been a searcher after truth. His mind was purely Oriental, and his researches were drawn from similar sources. Greek science and poetry he eagerly sought. He became a Christian, and went to Alexandria as the proper field for his mission. It was the great mint of thought and exchange for both the Eastern and the Western world. He lived and taught in the midst of persecution. "Daily," he wrote, "martyrs are burnt, beheaded, and crucified before our eyes." He himself was compelled to fly from the city, and of his subsequent history but little is known. One hymn of his is entitled "Hymn of the Savior Christ." It is full of simple and sublime imagery, chiefly drawn from Scripture. He calls Jesus the "Sure Guide of babes, Shepherd of royal sheep, Guide of children, King of saints, All-governing Word, Chief of Wisdom, Fisher of men, Perpetual Light." He says:

> "We hymn in simplicity the mighty Child,
> The chorus of peace, the kindred of Christ;
> The race of the temperate—
> We will praise together the God of peace."

There is evidently a falling off in the character of the hymns in this century. The Greek ideal pervades them; a certain Oriental grace is aimed at; a blending of figures for effect, which sacrificed song for poetry, praise for prettiness, the complication of colors for the simple design of the Christian Temple. It was the dawn of the monasticism of later times, and the contemplative rather than the practical type of the Christian system. The hymnody of Clement seems to be the median line between the two; and how the former prevailed over the latter all subsequent history of the Church fully shows. Invocations to Mary "the Mother of God"—"the all-holy"—crowd thicker and thicker on the later hymns. The air is burdened with sickly sentimentalism, until Mohammedanism broke suddenly all the strings of that alien harp which gave forth such discord. From hence a new language must become the vehicle of song. The language of Homer and the New Testament must give place to the language of Virgil, of Cicero, and the Vulgate.

The Latin hymns of the fourth and fifth centuries form quite a distinct school. Many of them were mere translations, wanting, however, the flexibility of the Greek language. It may be that what the Latin hymns lost in grace and in subtile shades of

thought; from that of the Greek, they gained in power and in calm dignity of speech.

The fourth century was peculiarly and truly an age of transition, Ambrose representing the relation between the Church and the State, and Augustine the relations of truth to the soul. The new Gothic element had been introduced into the State, and into the Church. A confused mass of heterogeneous elements were commingled together, and the Church sought to harmonize them. Ambrose introduced into the Church the responsive chanting, long since prevalent in the eastern Churches. The character of these early Latin hymns are like those of the Greek Church, chiefly objective. They were designed to keep alive among the masses the great truths and facts of our religion. They were educational in their character. Thus they had hymns not only for sunrise and sunset, but for every hour of the day—"prime, lauds, matins, terce, midday, nones, vespers, midnight"—and, in addition to this, they linked with the day and the year the great events of the Gospel history. They not only sung these in choirs in cathedrals, but chanted them in the fields and in their homes. There is no doubt but that the design was good, and, in many instances, proved beneficial, and, during those transitional periods in the empire, reached the great masses of the people. The seasons of the year became to them a great pictorial bible, addressed to their outward senses, and which, among much that was superstitious, kept alive the facts of the Gospel. It can not be doubted but that the Ambrosian hymnody exerted a mighty influence over the Gothic mind as well as the Latin; and, amid the fading glories of the empire, kept alive the faith and hope of men in forms of worship allied with Paganism, but enshrining spiritual and immortal truths, which otherwise might have utterly died out amidst the error and corruption which flooded both the Church and the State.

We have seen that lyric poetry has furnished nearly all the songs that properly belong to the hymnology of the Church. Its range is wide and ample. In Scripture it is the breath of inspiration; in art, the breath of human genius. Its very speech is song; it is interpenetrated with music; it is more than logic or argument, it is impulse and fire; it does not so much lead to victory as it is victory itself. Sometimes its strains are as plaintive as a woman's sigh, or stormy

as the Baltic, "lashed in foam and fury;" sad as the wail of the captives under the willows, or "spirit-stirring as the minstrelsy of glorious war."

A few reflections and we shall close. It will be seen that song or hymnody has had a permanent place in worship as far back as the records of the true religion have carried us; and it stands associated with all that is pure and lofty in worship. It is an element that can not be dispensed with.

We have seen that the hymns of the ages, rather than the creeds, are the living exponent of the religious life. The one speaks from the heart, the other from the reason. The polemic is the frozen period in the heart of the Church, and has left the northern and southern poles filled with impassable barriers. The songs of the Church have melted these mighty masses, and breathed over them an atmosphere of summer. And if ever unity and harmony shall be restored to the bosom of the Church, the songs of the ages will have much to do in accomplishing it.

It has also been seen that the Scriptural songs are a record of facts embodying great principles and living truths; and that the nearer to the Apostolic Church, the more simple and severely grand the hymns which they sung; and that the song held fast to the faith longer than the creed, and through the abounding corruptions of later days, the grandest of their chorals remained intact; and that, upon the whole, the heart of the Church has been more loyal than the intellect. In this phase of our subject have we not much in the future to hope?

IV.—ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.

IN the summer of 1867 there was in Rome a great gathering of Catholic bishops. The object of this gathering was twofold. In the first place, the 29th of June of that year, according to the Roman calendar, was the eighteenth centennial of the martyrdom of St. Peter; in the second place, the Sovereign Pontiff had announced that he should, on this centenary, canonize about a score of Dutch, Italian, and Spanish saints, and beatify some two hundred Japanese martyrs. Of course, to Romanists it was an important occasion. The saints were duly canonized, and the martyrs beatified. Before the bishops dispersed, his Holiness declared the necessity of an Ecumenical Council, and announced to them his intention to convoke one at an early date. True to his promise, on the next anniversary of the martyrdom of Peter, the Holy Father issued letters to all the bishops of the Catholic world, fixing the date of the Council, and summoning them to attend it. In these letters he named the 8th of December, 1869, as the time, and the city of Rome as the place of convocation. Subsequently he issued two letters of a different character—one addressed to the Greek bishops, the other to the Protestant sectaries—in which he urged them to profit by the Council to undertake again the work of reunion; in other words, to improve this favoring opportunity to submit themselves to the Roman See.

The posting of the Pope's bull of indiction upon the walls of the Lateran struck the Christian world with surprise. More than three hundred years had passed since the adjournment of the last General Church Council, and by what seemed unanimous consent it was agreed that another would never be convoked. Even so great a man and so good a Catholic as De Maistre had said "An Ecumenical Council had become a chimera;" and had given, as a reason, that "the world has been so much enlarged by the boldness of our sailors," that "for the convocation, of the bishops alone, and to establish legally this convocation, five or six years would not be sufficient." Protestant writers reflected on the intellectual, political,

and religious changes that three centuries had wrought; they saw that the Catholic doctrine was already well settled, and the discipline thoroughly consolidated; they thought a Council would lead to perplexing complications: hence, they had concluded that another was, to say the very least, among the extreme improbabilities. But the triumphs of science and art have practically annihilated the distances that, less than fifty years ago, seemed to De Maistre so formidable, and in utter disregard of all the good reasons that Protestants had given why another Council would not be called, the Pope has called one.

And the time draws near for its assembling. Rome is filled with preparations. One of the large chapels in St. Peter's church, which is capable of seating several thousand persons, has been chosen as the place of convocation. The principal architects of Rome, under the immediate supervision of the Pope himself, are providing the necessary accommodations. The altar of the Council is placed at one end of the chapel, the throne of the Pontiff at the other. The seats are arranging about the throne with reference to convenience and artistic effect, not at all disregarding the claims of hierarchical priority. A large and beautiful piece of black marble, found among the treasures of Nero, is to be made into an obelisk commemorative of the Council, and will be erected near the spot where tradition says Peter was crucified. Nor is this all. A number of commissions or committees, composed of eminent cardinals and theologians, are preparing the work to the Council's hand.

Such are some of the circumstances under which the Council of the Vatican will assemble. It will be an imposing, if not an important, event. It will consist of nearly one thousand bishops and cardinals, the chiefs of the most ancient, the most numerous, and the most powerful spiritual society in Christendom. They will come from the East and the West, the North and the South—from the old seats of civilization, and from regions where civilization is yet to be planted; some of them ruling dioceses and provinces more ancient than the oldest kingdoms of Europe; some of them presiding over churches planted in the midst of barbarism and heathenism. As many as forty or fifty different nationalities will be represented. When these men sit down together in the chapel of St. Peter's, around a head whom they all obey, around an altar where

all are brethren, and, all unmindful of the modern tongues, conduct their proceedings in the sonorous speech of Cicero and Virgil, despite our objections to the system, despite the ambition, envy, and ceaseless intrigue that lie back of the decorous forms that illy conceal the working of the human passions, we must call the assembly imposing and venerable!

The Catholic Church counts eighteen Ecumenical Councils. From the fourth to the sixteenth century they are frequent occurrences in ecclesiastical history. So long a time has elapsed since the last one, so great have been the changes, that the world has become wholly unfamiliar with such assemblies—so unfamiliar that even Catholic shepherds find it necessary to tell their flocks how councils are composed, what their functions are, and how they are to be regarded. If Catholics have become so unfamiliar with the attributes of a body which wields a power above the Pope, certainly a Protestant may be excused for instituting an inquiry into its origin, character, and functions, with a view to determine what it is, and what place it has filled in the Church economy.

For the typical Ecumenical Council we must go to the history of the old Catholic Church. Here it must be considered in connection with the whole synodical system, of which it was the crown. This system sprang out of the organization of the hierarchy.

The hierarchy of the old Catholic Church was a growth; full five centuries were required to bring it to perfection. It partook largely of the political organization of the Empire, if indeed it was not modeled after it, a fact that shows how intimately State and Church, after the time of Constantine, were blended. When the hierarchy at length stood forth complete, it was thus composed: At the bottom of the scale stood the presbyter or priest, presiding over his church; next above him stood the bishop, presiding over his diocese; next in order came the metropolitan or archbishop, presiding over his province; finally came the patriarchs, of whom there were, counting the honorary Patriarch of Jerusalem, five, each presiding over his patriarchate.*

Out of a hierarchy thus constituted, the synodical system naturally grew. It had its origin in the Apostolic Synod, or council, held

* "Still above the metropolitans stood the five patriarchs, the oligarchical summit, so to speak, the five towers in the edifice of the Catholic hierarchy of the Græco-Roman Empire."—*Dr. Schaff.*

in Jerusalem about A. D. 50, whose history is given in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. Like the hierarchy, it presented a gradation of orders. There was, first, the *Diocesan* or District Council, in which the Bishop presided over his clergy; second, the *Provincial* Council, in which the Metropolitan presided over the bishops of his province; third, the *Patriarchal* Council, composed of the bishops and metropolitans of a patriarchate, presided over by the Patriarch; last of all, the Ecumenical Council, the grand representative assembly of the Christian world. Between the two last, however, came a Council corresponding to nothing in the hierarchical system. This was the *National* Council, sometimes incorrectly called general. Of these there were two, the Latin and the Greek, standing for the two grand divisions of the Empire. Here again the powerful influence of political organization upon ecclesiastical is seen. In the technical language of ecclesiastical science, all the councils below the general are called *particular.* This synodical system is found in the Roman Church to-day, though modified in several particulars; the Patriarchal Councils have disappeared, the Christian world is the Catholic communion, and the Pope stands in the same relation to the Ecumenical Council that the Patriarch formerly did to the Patriarchal, or the Metropolitan to the Provincial.

We shall not inquire carefully into the jurisdiction and authority of the particular councils. Their decrees were only locally binding, and were not considered infallible. Appeals could be taken from the lower to the higher, the latter having a supervisory power. But the Ecumenical Council was on a grander scale. It is described by Dr. Schaff in this majestic language:

"Above the patriarchs, even above the Patriarch of Rome, stood the Ecumenical or General Councils, the highest representatives of the unity and authority of the old Catholic Church. They referred, originally, to the Roman Empire, but afterward included the adjacent barbarian countries, so far as those countries were represented in them by bishops. They rise up like lofty peaks or majestic pyramids from the plain of ancient Church history, and mark the ultimate authoritative settlement of the great questions of doctrine and discipline which agitated Christendom in the Græco-Roman Empire."*

In the middle of the third century the churches of Asia Minor held regular annual synods, consisting of bishops and presbyters. From that time we find an increasing number of such assemblies in

* "History of the Christian Church," vol. ii, pp. 330, 331.

the more important provinces of the Empire. The Council of Nicæa decreed that Provincial Councils should be held twice a year; the others were left to regulate themselves. Of most of the particular councils no records, or but meager ones, are left. But to extend Dr. Schaff's figure, if we can not always discover the hills and lesser mountains that rise up but a little distance above the plain of ancient Church history, there is no difficulty in tracing the lofty peaks that stand out so boldly defined against the eastern sky. By the opening of the fourth century there was already a considerable Christian literature, enough of which remains to give us a tolerably complete view of the first of these councils. In this literature it occupies a large place. And no wonder! After having been under the ban of the Empire for more than two hundred years, Christianity at last stood forth a State religion. From the Apostolic age the child had grown and waxed strong in spirit, but he had been in the deserts till this the day of his showing unto the Empire. But fourteen years previous to the Council the last and bloodiest wave of persecution had spent its force. The two great powers that had so long struggled for the mastery—one with spiritual, the other with carnal weapons—now stood face to face in peace, for the Church had triumphed. The city of Nicæa was the city of victory, and not the least interesting of the various aspects of the Council is this: it was a celebration of the Church's triumph. A study of this the most venerable and the most authoritative of all the Councils, will throw a strong light on the inquiry we are prosecuting.

Constantine was won over to the side of Christianity, in great part, by the apparent unity and harmony of the Christians. Wearied with the strifes and distractions of the State, he longed for something that had coherence and integrity. In the words of an eloquent historian:

> "He entered upon his relations to the Church as a traveler enters a new country, with high expectations, with hasty conclusions, with bitter disappointments. Of all these disappointments none was so severe as that which he felt when first he became acquainted with the fact that the Christian as well the heathen commonwealth was torn by factions. It had broken upon him gradually—first at Arles, then at Rome, when the African controversy of the Donatists was brought before him. But the culminating point was their wild outbreak, as it must have seemed to him, in the important province of Egypt."*

* Stanley: "History of the Eastern Church," p. 175.

We must now sketch the history of this "wild outbreak" which, more than all other causes combined, led to the calling of the Council of Nicæa.

Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, "attempted one day, in the presence of the presbytery and the rest of his clergy, to explain, with perhaps too much minuteness," says Socrates Scholasticus, "that great theological mystery, the unity of the Holy Trinity." One of the presbyters, named Arius, a man of considerable abilities for dialectical and theological speculation, thinking he saw heresy in the Bishop's sermon, "controverted his statements with excessive pertinacity." It requires no little acuteness of mind, and no inconsiderable concentration of thought, to even follow the history of the discussion; suffice it to say, the controversy was in that most elevated, most abstract, most difficult region of theology, the relation in which the Son stands to the Father. "From a little spark," says Socrates, "a large fire was kindled; for the evil which commenced in the church at Alexandria, ran throughout all Egypt, Libya, and the Upper Thebes, and at length diffused itself over the rest of the provinces and cities." Alexander excommunicated Arius and his abettors. He also wrote a letter to his "fellow-ministers of the Catholic Church every-where," in which he argued the question at issue, denounced the heretics, and concluded by saying, "It was incumbent on the Christians to withdraw themselves from all those who speak or entertain a thought against Christ, as from those who are resisting God, and are the destroyers of the souls of men." Any one familiar with the history of similar controversies can anticipate the course of events. Socrates continues: "By Alexander's thus addressing the bishops in every city the evil only became worse. . . . . Confusion every-where prevailed; for one saw not only the prelates of the churches engaged in contention, but the people also divided, some siding with one party and some with the other. . . . . Thus letters from the opposite parties were sent to the Bishop of Alexandria, and Arius made a collection of those which were favorable to himself; while Alexander did the same with those which were adverse."

Finally the matter came to the knowledge of the Emperor, who was "deeply grieved." He resolved, if possible, to arrest the progress of the controversy. Accordingly he sent the great Hosius, Bishop of Cordova in Spain, to Alexandria, the bearer of a letter to

Alexander and Arius. In this letter he evinces the qualities of mind that men of affairs commonly bring to the consideration of theological subtilties. He first states the origin of the difficulties, charging the bishop with "mooting a subject improper for discussion," and the presbyter with "rashly giving expression to a view of the matter such as ought never to have been conceived." He then exhorts to toleration:

"Permit me further to remind you of your duty by an example of an inferior kind. You are well aware that even the philosophers themselves, while all confederated under one sect, yet often disagree with each other on some parts of their theories; but although they may differ in their views on the very highest branches of science, yet in order to maintain the unity of their body, they will agree to coalesce. Now, if this is done amongst them, how much more equitable will it be for you, who have been constituted ministers of the Most High God, to become unanimous with one another in the same religious profession!"

He exhorts to forgiveness:

"Wherefore let an unguarded question and an inconsiderate answer, on the part of each of you, procure equal forgiveness to one another."

He descends to passionate entreaty:

"Return again, therefore, to a state of reconciliation; and by so doing give back to me tranquil days, and nights free from care; that to me also there may be some pleasure in the pure light, and that a cheerful serenity may be preserved to me during the rest of my life."*

But all to no purpose. Neither the exhortations of Constantine nor the authority of Hosius availed. The pestilent spirit that had been raised would not "down" at the bidding even of an emperor. As he brooded over the troubled condition of the Church, there sprang up in Constantine's mind—as he says "by a divine inspiration"—the idea of convoking the representatives of the whole Church in general assembly. This idea carried into execution resulted in the first Ecumenical Council. Accordingly he addressed letters to all the bishops, calling them to Nicæa, a lively commercial town near the imperial residence at Nicomedia, the ancient capital of Bythinia. Here the bishops, three hundred and eighteen in number, each attended by two presbyters and three slaves, gathered early in the summer of 325, five years after the "wild outbreak" in Egypt.

Constantine opened the Council in person. After delivering a

* "The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates surnamed Scholasticus," book i, chaps. v, vi, vii.

sonorous Latin oration, abounding in pious sentiments, he gave liberty to the presidents whom he had chosen to proceed with the business. It does not come within the scope of this article to give a detailed account of the proceedings. Those who would have their fill of *Homoousios*, *Homoiousios*, and *Hupostasis* are referred to the standard works on ecclesiastical history. There were the usual embarrassments and delays, the usual criminations and recriminations, the usual arguments and rejoinders, the usual finesse and manipulation; but in what must be confessed a short period of time the Council had finished its work. The paschal controversy had been settled, the doctrines of Arius had been condemned, his book, "Thalia," burned, and the heretic himself exiled. Before the close of summer the bishops had dispersed.

But the most important work done at Nicæa was the formulating and promulgating of the Nicene Creed, intended to put an end forever to theological controversy. After the Apostles' Creed it is the most ancient, the most authoritative, the most widely-received creed of Christendom. It is revered by the Greek, by the Catholic, by the Anglican, and by many of the Evangelical Churches. "The Word of the Lord which was given in the Ecumenical Council of Nicæa," says Athanasius, "remaineth forever." The text, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which the fathers have set," is also applied to it. Besides the Creed, the Council also ordained twenty canons. These may be divided into four groups, thus: 1. Seven relating to clerical jurisdiction; 2. one relating to worship; 3. four relating to the manners and morals of the clergy; 4. eight relating to cases of conscience which arose in dealing with those who had apostatized in the recent persecutions. The decrees were signed by all the bishops, approved by the emperor, and then sent out as an authoritative statement of the faith and discipline of the Imperial Church.

Thus it is seen that the first Ecumenical Council was an extraordinary assembly occasioned by a great theological controversy. The others were called at irregular periods to settle what were, or were regarded, important questions of doctrine and of discipline. In the foregoing sketch of Nicæa occur several points that deserve fuller elaboration.

I. *Political character.* The very word *ecumenical* is suggestive of State relationships. The *oikoumenee*, in the oldest classic usage,

was the inhabited world; then, the world inhabited by Greeks; in its imperial usage, the Roman Empire, the *Orbis Romanus*. But as the bishops of the barbarians outside the Empire were admitted, the *Synodos Oikoumenikee*, the *Concilium Universale*, the General Council, represented the entire Catholic Christian world.

But there is more certain evidence of State relationship. The Council of Nicæa was summoned, conducted, and confirmed by Constantine, as the six following Councils were by his successors. As this is generally denied by the Roman divines, these points must be drawn out in more detail.

In the first place, the call of a Council emanated from the reigning emperor. He fixed the time and place of meeting, summoned the bishops, and paid the entire expense from the imperial treasury. In some cases, perhaps in most, the emperor may have been induced to issue the call through the representations of the ecclesiastics, as was natural; but the ultimate power was lodged in himself alone. "The supreme chief of the Church, the Pope, and he only," says Bishop Dupanloup, "has the right of convoking General Councils." Anciently it was not so. The Nicene fathers were called together without previous advice or consent from the Bishop of Rome. The Catholic claim that Pope Sylvester had some share in the convocation of the first Council can not be traced higher than the third Council of Constantinople, held in 680. It is quite true that the Papal influence became more and more prominent as the Bishop of Rome gained power; but it did not become predominant until the last of the seven great Councils had been held.* Indeed, the hand of the temporal prince can be seen in the later Councils.† When the Byzantine emperors were no longer accessible, owing to schism in the Church and the conquests of the Mohammedans, the emperors of Germany, the chiefs of the new "Holy Roman Empire," succeeded to the rights of Constantine. In the Middle Ages, if the Popes called the Councils, the emperors sanctioned the call. "An appeal to a General Council," says Stanley, "was the half-temporal, half-spiritual weapon which the emperors and kings of Europe always

*The Roman Catholic Church historian Hefele concedes all that is here claimed: "The first eight General Councils were appointed and convoked by the emperors; all subsequent Councils, on the contrary, by the Popes."

†"General Councils may not be gathered together but by the commandment and will of princes."—*Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.*

held in reserve as a rejoinder to a Papal interdict." This eloquent writer based his prediction that another General Council would never be held on the fact that there is no longer an Emperor to unite with the Pope in summoning one. The wars of Napoleon stripped the emperors of Austria of the empty title they had so long worn, Emperor of Germany.

In the second place, the emperors presided over the Councils in person or by commission. This is contrary to the Roman claim. "The Pope alone," says Bishop Dupanloup, "has the right to preside over their [the bishops'] deliberations. And as a question of fact, it is true that Popes, either personally or by legates, have presided over every Ecumenical Council." So far from this being true, neither the Pope nor his legates presided at any one of the first seven Councils. In the two cases where the imperial majesty was not represented, the Patriarch of Constantinople, not the Pope, conducted the Council. In some instances the emperors largely influenced the proceedings. Constantine treated the Nicene fathers with great deference; nevertheless, his voice was potent in the discussions. Eusebius of Cæsarea would not sign the decrees until he had first consulted his imperial master as to their meaning.

In the third place, the emperor ratified the decrees. He signed them, gave them legal validity, made them laws of the realm, and punished those who refused to obey them. Here again the Papal influence, in time, obtruded itself; but it was not until the Middle Ages that the Pope's ratification became absolutely necessary to give the decrees of a Council binding force.

II. *Composition of the Council.* The bishops sat in the Councils by divine right, as successors of the Apostles. Sometimes the inferior clergy took part in the discussions, as Arius, the presbyter, and Athanasius, the deacon, at Nicæa, but this was by consent. Such clergy had no *votum decisivum*, unless, as was not unfrequently the case, they sat as representatives of their bishops. In the Councils of the Roman Catholic Church the bishops alone sit by right, but cardinals, abbots, and generals of religious orders sit by privilege.

Strictly speaking, therefore, there has been no such thing as an Ecumenical Council. The laity and inferior clergy were expressly excluded. The most that can be said, is that the early Councils were representatively ecumenical. Still further, only a small part of the

episcopate was ever in actual attendance. We quote a passage from Dr. Schaff:

"The province of North Africa alone numbered many more bishops than were present at either the second, the third, or the fifth General Council. The Councils bore a prevailingly Oriental character, were occupied with Greek controversies, used the Greek language, sat in Constantinople or in its vicinity, and consisted almost wholly of Greek members. The Latin Church was usually represented only by a couple of delegates of the Roman Bishop; though these delegates, it is true, acted more or less in the name of the entire West. Even the five hundred and twenty, or the six hundred and thirty members of the Council Chalcedon, excepting the two representatives of Leo I, and the two African fugitives accidentally present, were all from the East. The Council of Constantinople, in 381, contained not a single Latin bishop, and only one hundred and fifty Greek, and was raised to the ecumenical rank by the consent of the Latin Church toward the middle of the following century. On the other hand, the Council of Ephesus, in 449, was designed by Emperor and Pope to be an Ecumenical Council; but instead of this it has been branded in history as the synod of robbers, for its violent sanction of the Eutychian heresy. The Council of Sardica, in 343, was likewise intended to be a General Council, but immediately after its assembling assumed a sectional character, through the secession and counter-organization of the Eastern bishops."*

Such facts as these, it would seem, are rather damaging to the claim of infallibility. The voice of the Church, speaking through the bishops in council assembled, is infallible. But how many bishops must be in attendance? Can less than a majority speak for the Church? and if so, how small a minority? The theory is attended with insuperable difficulties.

III. *Jurisdiction and authority.* The Councils ranged over the whole field of doctrine, and morals, and of discipline. The doctrinal decrees were called dogmas or symbols; the disciplinary, canons. The former required a unanimous vote. But the means taken to secure unanimity were sometimes very extraordinary. The Robber Council of Ephesus reminds us of the Polish Diets, where the minority were either compelled to change their votes or, refusing, were slaughtered; other Councils remind us of the famous Long Parliament, so effectually "purged" by Colonel Pride. The authority of the Councils was supreme and final. The decrees were usually introduced with the Apostolic formula—*Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis*, "for it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Those relating to doctrine and morals were early invested with infallibility. Constantine called the Nicene decrees a *divine command;* the

* "History of the Christian Church," vol. ii, p. 333.

Council of Chalcedon pronounced them unalterable statutes, since God himself had spoken through them; the Council of Ephesus used this formula: "The Lord Jesus Christ, whom he [Nestorius] had blasphemed, determines through this most holy Council;" Gregory the Great placed the decrees of the first four Councils on a level with the four Gospels. Some of this phraseology may have been used in an accommodated sense, but it was all the fruit of an excessive veneration. There were men, however, in the ancient Church, as St. Augustine, who, while they did not regard the decrees as mere opinions that might be set aside by the private judgment of the believer, yet subordinated them to the Scriptures. The Roman Catholic theory is, not that Councils make dogmas, but that they infallibly declare what is taught in Scripture, and what has been handed down by tradition. "The Council of the Vatican," says *The Catholic World*, "will possess the same infallible authority with that which met at Jerusalem under St. Peter."

Perhaps no better opportunity will offer to speak of the number of the Councils, and of their relative rank. Seven are acknowledged by the Romanists, the Greeks, the Anglicans, and many of the Evangelicals to have been ecumenical. The first was held at Nicæa, A. D. 325; the second at Constantinople, 381; the third at Ephesus, 431; the fourth at Chalcedon, 451; the fifth at Constantinople, 553; the sixth at Constantinople, 680; the seventh at Nicæa, 787. Of these the first four outrank the others in dignity and importance. Here again we must discriminate. Nicæa and Chalcedon stand highest of all. To these seven the Roman writers add several others, for which they claim an ecumenical character. The claims of these are disallowed by all non-Catholic bodies,* as the claims of the approaching Council of the Vatican will be.

IV. *The Spirit of the Councils.* The Catholic writers are now painting charming pictures of the serenity, the harmony, the Christ-like spirit that will prevail in the Council of the Vatican. The pictures that the historian paints of most that have gone before it are something very far from charming. St. Gregory Nazianzen, who had

* The Roman writers do not agree in their lists. The following is the list of Bishop Dupanloup: Constantinople, 869; Lateran, 1123; Lateran, 1139; Lateran, 1179; Lateran, 1215; Lyons, 1245; Lyons, 1274; Vienna, 1311; Florence, 1439; Lateran, 1511; Franck, 1545. "Several sessions of the Council of Constance," he says, further, "have also been considered ecumenical."

been one of the presidents at Constantinople likened councils to "assemblies of cranes and geese." Some of the later councils would be more appropriately compared to dens of wild beasts. St. Gregory, when summoned by the Emperor to attend a synod, thus replied:

"To tell the truth, I am inclined to shun every collection of bishops, because I have never yet seen that a synod came to a good end, or abated evils instead of increasing them. For in these assemblies—and I do not think I express myself too strongly here—indescribable contentiousness and ambition prevail, and it is easier for one to incur the reproach of wishing to set himself up as a judge of the wickedness of others, than to attain any success in putting the wickedness away. Therefore I have withdrawn myself, and have found rest to my soul only in solitude."

"The meeting of a General Council," says Stanley, "is what a pitched battle is in military history." So far from the bishops coming together reverently to ask the Holy Spirit to lead them into all truth, they commonly come with their minds made up, their positions taken, bent on victory. They come to settle controversies that have taken deep hold of the prejudices and passions of the people. At Constantinople "every corner, every alley of the city was full of these discussions—the streets, the market-places, the drapers, the money-changers, the victualers. Ask a man 'how many oboli,' he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being; inquire the price of bread, and you are told, 'the Son is subordinate to the Father;' ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, 'the Son arose out of nothing.'" In that age the marvelous Greek intellect had lost its power to create, but it reveled in the subtilties of theological metaphysics. It was in the period of which Gibbon wrote: "The road to Paradise—a bridge as sharp as a razor—was suspended over the abyss by the master-hand of the theological artist." In Egypt during the "wild outbreak," according to Eusebius, "bishop arose against bishop, district against district, only to be compared to the Symplegades on a stormy day." Sailors, millers, and travelers, at their occupations, or on their journeys, sang a theology so abstract that it can hardly be stated in the English language.*

*"For the purpose of popularizing his statements with the lower orders, Arius wrote some songs under the name of 'Thalia.' The songs were set to tunes, or written in meters, which had acquired a questionable reputation from their use in the licentious verses of the heathen poet Sotades, ordinarily used in the low revels or dances of Alexandria; and the grave Arius himself is said, in moments of wild excitement, to have danced like an

When councils assembled under such circumstances, it should not be a matter of surprise that scenes sometimes transpired which beggar description. We quote an extract from the report of the Council of Chalcedon:

"And when the most reverend Bishop Theodoret entered, the most reverend the Bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine shouted out, 'Mercy upon us! the faith is destroyed; the canons of the Church excommunicate him. Turn him out! turn out the teacher of Nestorius!' On the other hand, the most reverend the Bishops of the East, of Thrace, of Pontus, and of Asia shouted out: 'We were compelled—at the former Council—to subscribe our names to blank papers; we were scourged into submission. Turn out the Manichæans! turn out the enemies of Flavian; turn out the adversaries of the faith!' Dioscorus, the most reverend Bishop of Alexandria, said, 'Why is Cyril to be turned out? It is he whom Theodoret has condemned.' The most reverend the Bishops of the East shouted out: 'Turn out the murderer Dioscorus! Who knows not the deeds of Dioscorus?' The most reverend the Bishops of Egypt, of Illyria, and Palestine shouted out: 'Long life to the Empress!' The most reverend the Bishops of the East shouted out: 'Turn out the murderers!' The most reverend the Bishops of Egypt shouted out: 'The Empress turned out Nestorius; long life to the Catholic Empress! The orthodox synod refuses to admit Theodoret.' Theodoret then being at last received by the Imperial officers, and taking his place, the most reverend the Bishops of the East shouted out: 'He is worthy—worthy!' The most reverend the Bishops of Egypt shouted out: 'Do n't call him bishop; he is no bishop. Turn out the fighter against God; turn out the Jew!' The most reverend the Bishops of the East shouted out: 'The orthodox for the synod. Turn out the rebels; turn out the murderers!' The most reverend the Bishops of Egypt: 'Turn out the enemy of God; turn out the defamer of Christ. Long life to the Empress; long life to the Emperor; long life to the Catholic Emperor! Theodoret condemned Cyril. If we receive Theodoret, we excommunicate Cyril.'"

And we are to believe that, in the midst of such scenes as this, infallible truths were formulated! But scenes more discreditable and scandalous were sometimes enacted.

There is no sadder period in the history of the Church than that treated by Gibbon in his forty-seventh chapter. It covers the times of Cyril and Nestorius, of Eutyches and Dioscorus. The doctrine of the incarnation was the absorbing theme—a theme that, for some reason, has aroused more of the *rabies theologorum* than any other in the whole history of theological controversy. While the debate was still pending the famous Robber Council of Ephesus sat. It was in

eastern dervish, whilst he sang these abstract statements in long, straggling lines, of which about twenty are preserved to us. To us the chief surprise is, that any enthusiasm should be excited by sentences such as these: 'God was not always Father; once he was not Father; afterward he became Father.'"—*Stanley:* "*History of the Eastern Church,*" p. 223.

this Council that Flavian of Constantinople was so injured by being trampled beneath the feet of the bishops—Dioscorus, the President, coming down from his throne to mingle in the *melèe*—that he died three days afterward. This Council, it is true, is not ranked among the Ecumenical Councils; but it was called in the usual manner and conducted in due form, and there is no reason why it has been robbed of its dignity, except that it became necessary to reverse its decrees. The blood of Flavian upon the Episcopal robes of the majority would not have been considered an objection; for was not the Council of Constance that sent John Huss to the stake "Ecumenical"?

Still, we should go wrong were we to dwell alone on the tumult, the intrigue, and the fanaticism. We have dwelt upon them because they show what so-called Christian assemblies, in darker ages, were capable of doing. Some of the councils have a comparatively clean record. At Nicæa there was plenty of excitement and hot temper; but it does not appear that it is chargeable with any thing scandalous or especially undignified. The fathers of Nicæa had not wholly lost the spirit of the Gospel. It is also quite true that in many of the other Councils men celebrated for learning, wisdom, and piety sat, and gave dignity and moral authority to the proceedings; in some of them men of this class may have predominated, but, on the whole, it is questionable whether bad men have often found assemblies that afforded them a better field in which to practice their peculiar arts. Still further, it must be observed that the councils have uniformly reflected the character of the age in which they sat, including a full share of its ignorance, its narrowness, and its fanaticism. We dismiss the topic with a quotation from the wise and temperate Milman:

"A General Council is not the cause, but the consequence, of religious dissension. It is unnecessary, and could hardly be convoked, but on extraordinary occasions, to settle some questions which have already violently disorganized the peace of Christendom. It is a field of battle in which a long train of animosities and hostilities is to come to an issue. Men, therefore, meet with all the excitement, the estrangement, the jealousy, the antipathy engendered by a fierce and obstinate controversy. They meet to triumph over their adversaries, rather than dispassionately to investigate truth. Each is committed to his opinions, each exasperated by opposition, each supported by a host of intractable followers, each probably with exaggerated notions of the importance of the question, and that importance seems to increase, since it has demanded the decision of a general assembly of Christendom." *

* "Latin Christianity," vol. i, p. 228.

The theory of the Ecumenical Council is, that it is called to meet some religious emergency, to condemn heresy, to declare the faith, to correct disorders. As it spoke with a voice more authoritative than the Pope himself, kings and emperors were accustomed to appeal to it in their conflicts with the Papacy. Catholic reformers looked to it as to their sheet-anchor. True, it is a sword that only the Pope can unsheathe; but the clamors of the people, the pleadings of reformers, and the demands of kings, have sometimes compelled him to draw it from its scabbard.

At the commencement of the Reformation councils were in high repute; only the Supreme Pontiff and his immediate adherents looked upon them with disfavor. They were regarded as fountains of cleansing and healing. Luther, sharing the common opinions, early appealed to a Council. But Christian Rome, in the days of Leo X, was what Pagan Rome had been in the days of Tacitus, "the common sink into which every thing infamous and abominable flowed from all quarters of the world," and the demand was unheeded. The situation is so well described by Mr. Lea that we quote a paragraph:

"The recollections of Constance and Bâle were full of pregnant warnings as to the almost inevitable antagonism between the Vicegerent of Christ and an independent representative body, believing itself to act under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, claiming autocratic supremacy in the Church, and convoked for the special purpose of reforming abuses, the most of which were fruitful sources of revenue to the Papal Court. Such a body, assembled in Germany, would be the Pope's master; if in Italy, his tool; and it behooved him to act warily if he desired to meet the unanimous demand of Christendom, without risking the sacrifice of his most cherished prerogatives. Had the Council been called in the early days of the Reformation, it could hardly have prevented the separation of the Church; yet, in the temper which then existed, it would probably have effected as thorough a purification of the ecclesiastical establishment as was possible in so corrupt an age. By delaying it until the reactionary movement had fairly set in, the chances of troublesome Puritans gaining the ascendency were greatly diminished, and the Papal Court exposed itself to little danger when, under the urgent pressure of the Emperor, it had at length, in 1536, proposed to convoke the long-desired assembly at Mantua." *

When the Council was finally called to meet at Mantua, the Germans, both Protestants and Catholics, and Henry VIII, of England, refused to submit their claims to it. They insisted that it should meet where it would be less under the influence of the Pope. With

* "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," p. 439.

consummate ability the Papacy baffled them for nearly thirty years. It was not until 1562 that the Council entered seriously upon its business in the city of Trent. The whole history is suggestive of the relations that have sometimes existed between different constituent parts of the Catholic Church.

Concerning the approaching Council we have but a word to say. Its convocation is attributed to the Jesuits. Precisely *why* it has been called, it is difficult to tell. As we write there is still a prospect that it may be postponed, perhaps indefinitely. The bull of indiction is extremely vague. Catholic writers say human society is "profoundly troubled." They fail to see that it is only when it is troubled that society, like the pool of Bethesda, has healing virtue. Probably an attempt will be made to carry through the Council some of the offensive dogmas put forth in the Pope's Encyclical Letter and Syllabus of December, 1864. The commissions appointed to prepare business indicate only the range of topics to be considered. They are the following: The Supreme Directive Congregation; the Commission of Ceremonies; the Commission for Eastern Affairs; the Politico-Ecclesiastical Commission; the Commission on Religious Orders and Congregations; the Commission of Dogmatic Theology; the Commission of Ecclesiastical Discipline. Evidently Pius IX desires to have the Council pass off smoothly. There is reason to suppose not only that the matters to come before the Council will be decided on, but that the decrees themselves will be fully formulated in advance of its assembling. Happy will the aged Pontiff and the Jesuits who manage him be if the Council meekly approves their work!

Even from the Catholic point of view the Council of the Vatican would seem to be wholly uncalled for. That it can in any considerable degree influence society is absurd. Councils were never such momentous occurrences as many suppose. Besides, times have changed. We can study an Ancient or even a Middle Age Council with gravity; but a Council in the latter half of the nineteenth century—held in the midst of its intense, exciting, secular life—verily it is an anachronism! Still, if the Catholics think this is the fifteenth century, if they find pleasure in reviving the antique, if the flavor of Nicæa, Chalcedon, and Constance is agreeable to their tastes, Protestants can well afford to leave them to their momentary enjoyment.

V.—WOMAN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH.

Woman's Suffrage; the Reform against Nature. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

Woman as God Made Her: the True Woman. By REV. J. D. FULTON. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1869.

THE interests involved in the subject herein to be treated are becoming so manifest that we can no longer either safely or innocently disregard them. To aid an investigation that may discover the whole truth as to woman's privileges in the kingdom of God, and that may ultimate in practically illustrating her unknown powers of "laboring in the Gospel," is the purpose of this brief attempt. It is a principle well settled among philosophers, that when any general ground-swell is felt in the public mind, even if it seek expression in some abnormal or monstrous development, there is, nevertheless, some truth, or some want in the heart of the community, that causes it, to which it is always well to give heed. Enceladus will turn over sometimes, and all Ætna can not keep him still. His groanings will be heard through some mouth-piece, in fiery eloquence that will alarm the indifferent, and compel attention to the relief of his heavy load.

Ever since the introduction of Christianity into the world woman has been rising from her heathen position toward her true relation as "partaker of the grace of life" with man. Her condition has paralleled the progress of civilization; and this has been marked by the progress of Christianity. And although the present demand for still extended rights to women does not *prove* an unjust limitation now, it at least demands an impartial re-examination of the whole question. It may be that the modern cry for "woman's rights," even unto suffrage and political office-seeking, is but the rebound of the mind from a sphere of action really too contracted, from a life too inactive and useless, the soul having had no outlet for a due expression of its active forces. A plant prevented from growing in its natural direction will seek abnormal growth. If the feet, or other parts of the body, be compressed in their growth, the vital

forces will express themselves in some deformity that could have been prevented by removing the obstructions to a natural and healthy development. It is not certain, but very probable, that had woman, during the last generation, enjoyed all her natural, civil, and religious privileges and outlets for doing good as the Bible teaches, these excrescent growths would never have appeared—so far, at least, as Christian women are concerned. While, therefore, we suggest no apology for the course of some political women, nor for their over-polite male attendants, whose feeble kindness leads only to the dethronement of woman from the sacredness of the position she now occupies, yet a certain palliation suggests itself even for the extremest views of those ladies who seem to be politicians "born out of due time."

As the present purpose is to discuss her work in the Church, it will, of course, be out of the way to say any thing scarcely concerning her civil rights. Others have written up this part of the subject better than it could be done here. The opportunity, however, should not be lost of expressing the conviction that some of our civil laws relating to the property of women—especially widows—are exceedingly unfair; that much of the prejudice against her making a living by certain kinds of secular employment, is wholly inexcusable. That popular opinion should, for example, frown upon her studying medicine under female teachers, and practicing it among her own sex especially, and among children, is as unpardonable on the part of men as would be the desire of a woman to stump the State in a political campaign. But as this is not our theme we shall leave it to other hands, and try to preserve our unity of thought by examining the New Testament as to the work of woman in the Christian Church.

The principal difficulty in our way arises from apparent contradictions in the Epistles as to her privileges in the Church. In two instances she is commanded to be in "silence," not to "teach nor to usurp authority over the man," and "if she will learn any thing, let her ask her husband at home." On the other hand, she had the gift of prophecy, which seems to have endowed her with the right to edify the Church. And this allusion obliges us, before proceeding farther, to determine the real meaning of the word "prophesy" as used in the New Testament, and then ascertainwhether prophecy was truly a part of woman's work in the Primitive Church. For the

etymological definition of the term involving its common use we refer to Dr. Wm. Smith's Bible Dictionary: "The ordinary Hebrew word for *prophet* is *nâbi*, derived from a verb signifying 'to bubble forth' like a fountain. Hence, the word means one who announces or pours forth the declarations of God. The English word comes from the Greek *prophetes*, which signifies, in classical Greek, one who *speaks for another*, especially one who speaks for a god, and so interprets his will to man. Hence, its essential meaning is *interpreter*. The use of the word in its modern sense, as 'one who predicts,' is post-classical!" Foretelling was but a small part of the prophet's work. See Nathan rebuking David, Jonah preaching repentance to the Ninevites, and all the major and minor prophets reproving and instructing Israel and Judah, restoring and expounding the law, and they will appear as teachers—Jewish preachers—rather than as mere foretellers. *Pro* means *for*, rather than *before*. They spake for God, "reproving, rebuking, and exhorting with all long-suffering and doctrine."

John the Baptist was a greater prophet than any of his predecessors, the chief business of whose life was to preach repentance, and prepare a people for the Lord. Jesus was a prophet of God, mighty in word and deed, and yet but little of his time was spent in predicting.

With these practical definitions of the word as used previous to the establishment of the Church of Christ, what might we expect "prophesy" to mean in the New Testament, with no hint given of a change in the work of a prophet? And that such is its meaning in the New Covenant is manifest from the writings of Paul in several places. "He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." (1 Cor. xiv, 3.) "He that prophesieth edifieth the Church." (Verse 4.) In the following verse prophesying is made the equivalent of speaking with tongues and interpreting, "that the Church may—in both cases alike—receive edifying." Again: "Ye may all prophesy, one by one, that all may *learn*, and all may be *comforted*." Without burdening the page with quotations, it is plain that prophesying was for comforting, edifying, and exhorting, and that all *might learn*. It is not denied that foretelling future events belonged to the prophets, but neither in the Old or New Covenant was this the principal part of their labor.

We are now ready to inquire whether women possessed the gift of prophecy in the Primitive Church, or whether it was confined to the men. Here again we must appeal to the Scriptures as our only guide in a dark place. "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and *your daughters shall prophesy*. . . And on my servants and *on my handmaidens* will I pour out of my Spirit in those days; and *they shall prophesy*." (Acts ii, 17, 18.) This is a quotation from the prophet Joel, uttered in reference to the Christian dispensation and the Christian Church.

In the same book—Acts of the Apostles—we learn that Philip the evangelist had "four daughters who did prophesy." That is, four daughters who, in some way, aided in the edification and instruction of the Church. In 1 Cor. xi, 5, also, we read: "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head, for that is even all one as if she were shaven"—a mark or penalty sometimes fixed upon the disreputable, and, of course, to be avoided by Christian women. "And if it be a shame for her to be shaven or shorn, let her then be covered," while prophesying. This injunction, as to covering the head, doubtless grew out of the habits of the times and of society, and was intended to guard the Church from evil report; and although the occasion for such caution may have entirely passed away, the fact remains that women in the Primitive Church did prophesy. Whatever this fact may lead to—the subversion of long-settled convictions, or even the public ministry of women in the congregation—the fact itself remains, no more to be ignored or denied than that the disciples met together on the first day of the week to break bread.

Anna was a prophetess fourscore years of age. (Luke ii.) Deborah was a prophetess, and judged Israel. (Judges iv, 5.) "She was not so much a judge as one gifted with prophetic command." Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron, the three deliverers—Micah vi, 4—was also a "prophetess"—a gift that expressed itself in her poetry and music. (Ex. xv, 20.) But above all the Jewish prophetesses, Huldah, the wife of Shallum, stands pre-eminent in being appealed to by the king, when Hilkiah, the priest, found the book of the law, to obtain an authoritative opinion concerning it. When the king "inquired of the Lord," he sent to Huldah.

This induction, together with the definition and use of the term, demonstrate that when the Jewish Church was being merged into the Christian, the latter would feel no shock of its sense of propriety in seeing women possessed of the gift of prophecy. They knew that both Huldah and Deborah had interpreted the will of God, that Miriam had borne a conspicuous part with her brothers in the exodus of their nation, and were hence not unprepared to see the "daughters" and "handmaidens" receive the gift of prophecy, and speak to the "comfort, exhortation, and edification of the Church." (1 Cor. xiv, 5.)

Notwithstanding all this, Paul has legibly written it: "Let your women keep silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted to them to speak, for it is a shame for women to speak in the Church," and the difficulty is to reconcile this with the indisputable fact of their possessing the gift of prophecy. Should it be urged that this gift was exercised in private worship and not in the congregation, the reply might be that her "praying or prophesying with her head covered" clearly implies the publicity of these devotions—that the necessity of covering the head could not apply to her private devotions, morning and evening, in her own private apartments. This approaches that sharp line and true distinction to be drawn where so often two truths face each other in such attitude as to threaten inevitable collision. But as all our trouble in such cases arises from our failure to assign to each truth its proper limits, and not from any real opposition of truth to truth, hope may always be indulged that a little more study may make it plain. The question then returns to us: What position did Primitive Christian women occupy that was public enough to demand the vail upon their heads, and yet not as public as pulpit preaching—what position between the closet and the rostrum that suits the exercise of their undeniable powers of doing good both in "edifying, exhorting, and comforting" the Church?

That women did labor in the Gospel in some way is evident from many Scriptures. "I beseech thee also, true yokefellow, help those women who labored with me in the Gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-laborers, whose names are in the book of life." (Phil. iv, 3.) Who these women were we are not informed. Lydia may have been among them. Whoever they were, they were in the

habit of "laboring in the Gospel," not only with Paul, but "with Clement also," and other ministers of the Gospel—Paul's "fellow-laborers." All ministers visiting and laboring in Philippi—Timothy, Erastus, and Silas were doubtless among them—were aided by these sisters in some way in the furtherance of the Gospel.

Of Phœbe, servant—*diakonos*—of the Church at Cenchrea, it is said, "She hath been a succorer of many, [ministers,] and of myself also." Here again we are uninformed as to the particular way in which she was "a helper of many," but it is very plain that she was more than a servant of the Church in merely carrying the Epistle to the Romans from the hand of Paul; for it was her habit to succor all ministers who came to Cenchrea. Whether she or any other woman was a deaconess in an official sense, or simply a volunteer in every good work, is a matter of little consequence in this paper, as it is their *work*, official or unofficial, we are seeking to ascertain. That she was useful in the cause of Christ in more ways than one is more than probable, since it was customary in those days to make messengers of those who could not only bear tidings, but do good in other ways at the same time. The brethren of Antioch sent their contributions to Jerusalem "by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." The Church at Philippi sent pecuniary aid to Paul by Epaphroditus, "a companion in labor and fellow-soldier." Also when the collections were sent from Macedonia and Achaia to Jerusalem, Paul and other ministers were selected for that purpose—perhaps in order that more than one purpose might be effected by the same instrumentalities; and Phœbe, being the bearer of this important letter, was probably able also to do other service suitable for Christian women.

Having now seen that, while the platform is not the scene of woman's activities in the Church, and also that her ministries are not confined to the closet nor even to private in-door labors, we proceed to specify a few of the many fields of Christian activity that open to her, and which she must enter if the work of the Lord is to prosper in our hands.

The modern notion that teaching, prophesying, and all kindred ministries are, for the most part, to be performed in the pulpit, or in some way before public assemblies, is the chief cause of confusion as to this subject. The field of action being considered so circum-

scribed, and the true scene of labor, where most of the Christian activities ought to present themselves, being practically ignored or despised, a rush is being made for the pulpit as the only outlet for those sisters who would "labor in the Gospel." The logical conclusion of many reasonings is, that unless we lay upon Christian women the burdens of evangelists, bishops, elders, circuit riders, curates, rectors, immersers, and traveling revivalists, there is little for them to do. The pulpit mania is characteristic of these degenerate days. Teaching is all to be done in the pulpit, not "from house to house." Paul was behind the times. "By the space of three years he ceased not to warn *every one*, distributively, night and day, with tears." Individual improprieties, that require, mainly, personal correction, must be harangued at from the pulpit. Warnings to sinners must all come at long range from the pulpit. Christianity is to be taught, young disciples are to be encouraged, meeting-houses to be built, missionary cause to be promoted, prayer meetings and Sunday schools to be kept up, and almost every other good to be monopolized by the pulpit. Not that this mania has seized the good women especially, but such seems to be the teaching and practice of the times; and women, assuming it to be correct, have felt the narrowness of their sphere, and seek expression in what seems to be the almost only method of laboring in the Gospel. And in this view it is not easy to see how Phœbe could be a "succorer of many" preachers; or how those other women who "labored with Paul, with Clement, and other fellow-laborers," could do so without occupying the platform. It is assumed that prophesying was all performed in public, and hence the apparent contradiction between this and Paul's prohibition of public preaching as to the sisterhood. It is admitted that prophesying was not a closet observance, neither can it be proved that this work was done upon the platform, nor is it necessary, as there is a wide field of operation embraced in neither of these.

It is quite certain that no very large part of the labors, either of Jesus or his Apostles, was performed in the public assemblies. They "went about doing good." "Daily in the temple and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." Philip preached to the eunuch in a carriage on the way. Paul and Silas preached to the jailer and his house at midnight. On the dispersion at Jerusalem the disciples went every-where, preaching to whomsoever they met,

"in season and out of season." The habits of these times encourage preaching *in* season—at regular appointments, at stated times, in congregations convened to hear preaching—but not out of season—"When thou comest in, and when thou goest out; when thou liest down, and when thou risest up," by the wayside, from house to house, without appointment, and without invitation. Were this method of preaching still recognized, there would be no lack of opportunity for godly women to "labor in the Gospel" to the full extent of their ability, just as they did in the days of the Apostles. We do not claim that the New Testament specifies every act of service a Christian woman can perform, but that there is light enough to guide her in her highest and holiest efforts for the Savior.

It is competent for her to do any work a *Christian* ought to do, except the one act of *pulpit* preaching, which in the division of labor God has assigned to men. And this is no disparagement of her usefulness in the Church any more than man's usefulness is underestimated by the assignment of a certain work to women that men could not very well perform. (See Titus ii, 5.) Man is just as unfit to teach "the young women to be chaste, keepers at home," etc., as woman is to be presiding elder. All members of the body can not and ought not to perform the same part of the work. If, however, Divine Wisdom had intimated no division of labor between Christian men and women, "nature itself would teach us" that the rostrum part of it is not that which woman could perform the best; and even if the abstract *right* to be a traveling evangelist through heat and cold, over sea and land, in the highways and hedges, and to bear the brunt, as Paul did, be granted, it might still be a question whether this would be the most judicious division of labor. Horace Mann said: "A woman has a *right to sing bass*," but the fact that singing bass would not be the most useful exertion of her vocal capacity, would of itself suggest her true vocal *rights*. God, who made each member of the body, has assigned each its own work, and woman has no more right to complain (as only a few do) of the inhibition as to public preaching than man has of the implied prohibition above referred to. It is very probable that when Christianity began to release woman from her menial heathen condition, the rebound of mind to another extreme, developing some of the obnoxious features of our modern "strong-minded" women, inducing confusion in the Church, was the immediate

cause of Paul's commands. Certainly the intention was not to restrict them in any good work to which their gifts and calling adapted them. Any thing, then, that a *Christian* may do, may be done by a Christian woman, with the single exception named; and under this generalization may be noticed the following specifications:

1. The gift of prophecy belonged both to men and women. Men prophesied both from "the sacred desk," as the moderns would say, and also in a more private way; women in the latter method only, which is the more important of the two, as appears from the fact that all of woman's powers and time, and the greater part of man's, were anciently engaged in this way. That prophesying means speaking to "edification, exhortation, and comfort of the Church, is also patent from 1 Cor. xi, 3. That edifying the Church does not necessarily involve public preaching has been proved before. A broad field lies open to every disciple in personal labor from house to house, in Sunday-schools, in private Bible classes, and in a thousand ways now overlooked by the constant gaze upon the pulpit as the coveted field of usefulness. Such is the tendency, even with some ministers, to overlook the value of all labor outside of the pulpit that no greater blessing, perhaps, could come upon them and their Churches than some civil disability that would forbid their public preaching by the space of five years, at least, leaving them no means of access to the public mind but that of teaching "from house to house." This would be followed by several good results. It would train the preacher's mind to habits of laboring "out of season;" it would teach him how to preach privately; it would bring woman into the field by exalting that kind of labor she is so eminently fitted to perform; it would drive from the ministerial office all men possessed of too little religion to labor in this way; it would develop a new class of men, not possessed, indeed, of much pulpit ability, but capable of building up the saints by private ministrations in their most holy faith; it would convert the world, revive the Church, and inaugurate a new era among men. How many men of God, burdened with the desire to continue day and night in the temple, if only their families could be fed and clothed, are kept out of the field because they are not pulpit orators! How many women would gladly "labor much in the Lord," if their abilities and their proper field of labor

were recognized by men! The number of laborers that could be brought into the field from these two classes would astonish the very men who are constantly praying "the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest." No marvel that in ancient days "multitudes were added to the Lord," when multitudes of laborers were in the field. Those scattered abroad on the persecution that arose about Stephen, went every-where—to Samaria, Cyprus, Phenice, and Antioch—preaching the Word, whether they could perform well in the pulpit or not. Philip, the evangelist, and some others doubtless, preached publicly, but many women, as well as men, prophesied from house to house, pressing the Word home to the consciences of thousands who would listen to no public discourse.

2. Whether an order of women was set apart in the Apostolic Churches called "deaconesses" is not certain. The simple circumstance of Phœbe's being called a *diakonos* of the Church at Cenchrea is hardly conclusive, since this term is as generic in its use as the Latin word *minister*. Christ was called a deacon (*diakonos*) of the circumcision. Paul was a deacon, Timothy a deacon ("a good *diakonos* of Jesus Christ"). Satan also has his deacons, who are transformed as the *diakonoi* of righteousness—sometimes used in an official and sometimes in an unofficial sense. Still, there are several circumstances to be stated, which, if they fail to prove official position for certain women in the Church, do not fail to prove a very special work for them to do in the furtherance of the Gospel.

a. Phœbe was a *servant of the Church* at Cenchrea. She served *the Church*, then, in some way. Could this be said of every sister in that Church? If so, a *diakonos* of a Church means simply a member of that Church. If diakonos means any thing more than a member, or even an active member, Phœbe must have held some appointment under the Church authorities. A servant of God, a servant of a king, a government, and a servant of a Church would each seem to be under employ.

b. We are told in Titus ii, 3, that "the aged women should be in behavior as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, *teachers* of good things; *that they may teach the young women* to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, obedient to their own husbands that the Word of God be not blasphemed." Here, although no official

position is predicated of these aged women, an abundant work is laid open before them—a work of teaching, prophesying, speaking, though not in the pulpit, yet "speaking unto edification, exhortation, and comfort." This passage is perhaps the foundation of the convictions of many that certain godly women ought to be set apart in every Church to minister in many things among their own sex. If old women teach the younger to love their husbands, and to be keepers at home, they would not be suspected of self-interest, as men might be; and surely exhortations to be obedient to their own husbands, and especially to be chaste, would come with more propriety from the aged women than even from the oldest bishops of the Church. The entire field of labor lying in this direction is not only open to women, but legitimately belongs to them under the superintendence of the elders. If in Crete there was no order of deaconesses set apart for this business, it is very certain that the ministers of the Churches were to enlist the "aged women" in this service. Paul commanded Titus to see that this work was done by the older sisters. Titus was responsible for putting all the Church forces into operation, and if modern ministers felt the same responsibility there would be fewer idlers in the Church than now, more laborers in the vineyard, fewer lifeless members, because fewer that have nothing to do.

c. In the last chapter of Romans the names of six different women are given, with the following notices:

Phœbe "has been a succorer of many and of myself also."

Aquila and Priscilla for Paul's life "laid down their own necks," to whom "not only he but all the Churches of the Gentiles give thanks." She helped her husband to save Paul's life.

Mary—"who bestowed much labor on us."

Tryphena and Tryphosa—"who labor in the Lord."

The beloved Persis—"who labored much in the Lord."

Upon these passages we may remark,

First. That the Greek word here translated *labor* signifies "labor unto weariness or fatigue," so that the services rendered by those women were not an occasional visit to the sick, or the preparing an occasional meal for the Apostle. They "labored much in the Lord," and "bestowed much labor on us." Besides the expression "Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who LABOR in the Lord," seems to indicate

a *habit* of so laboring then existing, and not an occasional good deed. And if it be asked what particular duties these all performed, we reply, they did any thing that the Bible enjoins on *Christians*, except the public preaching and government of the Church, which God, in the division of labor, has laid upon men.

Second. The fullest account we have of the labor of any one woman in the primitive Church is that of Priscilla. Banished from Rome with her husband, Paul first found them in Corinth, with whom he worked at tent-making, and whom he probably converted by private preaching—preaching "out of season." He took them with him to Ephesus, where the two took Apollos apart and "expounded to him the way of the Lord more perfectly." In this case a woman was found capable of teaching a man, nor was it any infraction of the law, for they took him *unto themselves*, and taught him. If Aquila was a public teacher, the manner of her assistance may have been illustrated by the labors of Christian woman traveling with her evangelist husband. While he taught "publicly and from house to house," she "ceased not in every house to teach and preach Jesus Christ." She could reach many to whom he had no access. Besides this she, every morning, had a large Bible class, intended principally for her own sex, but which was soon filled up with all classes of hearers, many of whom learned the way of the Lord more perfectly who might never have been affected from the pulpit. This was one of those women who "labored much in the Lord;" and while she never threw away the charm of female modesty on the rostrum, she often spoke to edification, to comfort, and exhortation.

Priscilla seems to have traveled somewhat with her husband in this holy ministry. She was in Corinth, in Cenchrea, in Syria, in Ephesus, and back again in Rome, where a congregation of disciples met in their house, and was so committed to the work that, with her husband, she had been a succorer of many ministers, and at one time was willing to lay down her neck for Paul's life, and received the thanks of all the Churches of the Gentiles therefor.

But if we desire modern instances of what Christian women can do in the Gospel of Christ, look at the missionary women in the Orient. More than one half of all the labor done to rescue the heathen is the work of women. They teach religion in families, read the Scriptures to them, distribute Bibles, tracts, and other religious

literature, educate the youth, instruct the heathen women in the knowledge of God. Of such Paul would say, "Help those women who labored in the Gospel with me and with Clement also, and other of my fellow-laborers whose names are in the Book of Life." "Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord," and "the beloved Persis, who labored much in the Lord." Seeing there was no need to detail the special kinds of work they performed when, with a single exception, the whole field of Christian activity lies open before them, and, as before intimated, had not the people almost deified the pulpit as the almost only sphere of usefulness, no clamor for wider fields would ever have been heard from these "helpers in Christ Jesus."

In confirmation of what has been said of the usefulness of woman's labor as missionaries, we quote from the *Eighth Report of the Woman's Union Missionary Society*, under the caption of "Woman's Work:"

"If ever there was a work adapted to Christian women it is that which this Society represents. It was organized and incorporated in 1861, and has gone on with increasing usefulness until now. Its object is the conversion of their Oriental sisters, and the lifting up to a higher and more intelligent existence the secluded, we may almost say *imprisoned*, females of India and China.

"Shut up in their zenanas, they pass a listless, languid existence, the mere playthings of their sensual masters, having no aspirations above the daily insipid routine of animal life. How shall these precious souls be reached, and roused, and made to feel that they are immortal and responsible? Our *men* missionaries can not get access to them. A veteran in mission work said to Mrs. N.: 'The Gospel needs to be taken to the *women* of India, but, as a man, I feel myself cut off from half the people.' 'It is utterly impossible,' says another, 'for a preacher of the Gospel in heathen lands to make any attempt for the culture of women.' 'Raise the women of India,' says another, 'and you lift 200,000,000 from gross idolatry.' It is God who started this enterprise. Single women, moved by love to Christ and the soul, have found their way into the zenanas, and, sitting beside the imprisoned inmates, have told them of Jesus and his love, and the languid eye has kindled and the heart has been touched."

Thus may women labor in the Gospel; and thousands are already there, where thousands more should be sent, to carry the light to those who sit in the region and shadow of death.

But why do the Scriptures lay the preaching in public entirely on men? For two reasons:

1. It is the best division of labor. If women had a *right* to fell the forests, to act the warrior, to preach in the forum, to be bruised

and battered at the polls, and assume the *toga virilis*, still the exercise of that right would be very questionable. We speak of man's sphere and woman's sphere, but the truth is neither of them has a sphere, but each a hemisphere. The two united make a sphere, and God has forbidden the one to occupy the position of the other. The Jewish law forbade their dressing alike. "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth to a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment, for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord." (Deut. xxii, 5.) In the same spirit it is said, it is "a shame for a man to have long hair," as it is also a shame for a woman to have "her head shaven or shorn." The Lord does not love "manly women," nor "womanly men." They both alike are "abomination unto the Lord." For a man to affect softness and delicacy, instead of strength and courage, is no less disgraceful than for a woman to affect masculinity and seek outdoor notoriety at the hustings, in the halls of Congress, or on the battle-field. She should neither be elected constable, sheriff, nor policeman; she should neither plow nor reap, nor gather into barns; she has no right to be a blacksmith, a grave-digger, nor a "rail-splitter;" a city scavenger, a steamboat captain, or a sailor; in brief she has no right to act the man. The Church has no need of such, nor the government, nor does any man fit to be a husband desire any such "strong-minded" woman for a wife. A true woman despises femininity in a man, because he is trenching upon ground he has no right to. What if men should clamor for some of the precious rights of woman, the right of protection, support, exemption from war, from field, and shop labor, etc., and claim that otherwise there was no equality—has not God assigned each sex their proper place, and granted a certain superiority to each? That these respective hemispheres have been wisely marked out in the Bible every day's experience and all sound philosophy continually attest.

2. Another reason for forbidding women to preach publicly grew out of the state of society then existing. Woman suddenly feeling the enfranchising power of the Gospel, and learning that in "Christ there is neither male nor female," naturally enough committed some excesses that were about to place her among the discreditable in society. Throwing off the veil and other symbols of modesty seemed at once to classify her with certain disreputable women. Tacitus informs us (*De moribus Germanorum*) that the Germans of that day

always punished prostitutes by cutting off their hair or shaving the head, to which suspicion Christian women were not allowed to expose themselves by any supposed liberty of the Gospel, or by any assumption of unveiled manliness. The dress of the sexes in those days being so much alike, the appearance of a woman with short hair was not dissimilar to that of a man, and presented an indecency about the same as if a woman would nowadays go about with men's clothes on. Paul was protecting women against slander and "shame," and should receive the thanks instead of the censures of women of modern times.

If women, by their dress, or the part they wish to take in public affairs, assume the place of men, they should be content to take men's fare, and renounce their special privileges. The special courtesies extended in public and private circles, on the streets, in public conveyances, and every-where should never be looked for if there be no difference between the hemisphere of man and that of woman. But if there be such distinction marked out, both by nature and revelation, it involves distinctive duties for each, among which voting, holding political and military offices, public preaching, and baptizing certainly do not belong to women.

Another fact in ancient society that made it necessary for Paul to protect Christian women was found in the conduct of the heathen priestesses, whose unveiled ravings, disheveled hair, and disregard of female modesty made it necessary to avoid all appearance of effrontery on the part of sisters in the Church, "that the Word of God be not blasphemed," and lest the prophesyings of the one, and the Delphic afflatus of the other, should be confounded as one and the same. (See Æneid vi, 1–48.) We hence conclude that, to secure the best division of labor, and to protect both the constitution and character of women, they are excused from the pulpit department of Christian labor. This would seem in no way to interfere with her songs, and prayers, and teachings in a more private way. Her influence in Sunday schools, social meetings, Bible classes, "from house to house"—in raising money for missionary and other benevolent objects, in special instructions to her own sex, in praying with the sick and dying, in caring for young members, and in all the holy ministries now opening and soliciting her zeal in missionary labor, both at home and broad—into all these fields she should be

called, nor will the Church of Christ ever discover her innate power until woman is invited into these many fields of usefulness, and supported in the work. Already in foreign missionary fields there are two women for every man engaged, and happy is that people who can enlist the exquisite talent, the genius, the spiritual insight, the intuitions, and the unselfish, heroic affections of this prize essay from the hand of God; but let her ever be protected from the asperities intended only for man, "because of the angels."

VI.—JERUSALEM.

City of the Great King; or, Jerusalem as it was, as it is, and as it is to be. By J. T. Barclay. Philadelphia: James Challen & Sons.

Palestine, Past and Present. By Rev. Henry S. Osborne, A. M. Philadelphia: James Challen & Sons.

Tent Life in the Holy Land. By Wm. C. Prime. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Sinai and Palestine, in connection with their History. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D. New York: W. J. Widdleton.

The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula. By Carl Ritter. 4 vols. 8vo. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The Land and the Book; or, Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery of the Holy Land. By Rev. W. M. Thompson. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Far East; or, Letters from Egypt, Palestine, and other Lands. By N. C. Burt, D. D. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co.

The Land and the Story. By N. C. Burt, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

TO the critical student of the literature relating to Jerusalem, or the close observer who has sojourned in its midst, it is not necessary to say that it is not the purpose of the writer to exhaust, in the limits of a single article, any department of the subject. The attempt would be as unwise as unsuccessful.

Nor has the writer any theory to establish, or any new solution of topographical difficulties to present at this time. His purpose, in the present article, is simply to present, as succinctly as possible, an epitome of Jerusalem, briefly touching upon the various departments

into which a consideration of the subject naturally divides, with the object of attracting the attention of the reader to Palestinic literature, and leading to its more thorough study.

If, notwithstanding the fragmentary character that must necessarily belong to the treatment of so broad a subject in limits so narrow, he shall succeed in the object mentioned, he will be abundantly gratified, and neither expect nor desire praise for any other excellency; and he begs that his work may be judged by its fitness for this his object, and not by the rigorous demands of some more critical purpose, which his modesty would not allow him to form or his ability to achieve.

No apology is necessary for the selection of the theme. By a common consent of all the peoples of the earth who worship the true God, whether Christian or Theistic, the sometime stronghold of David, the once splendid capital of Judea, the beautiful star in the eastern crown of Rome, has become, even in its desolation, and shame, and sorrow, the center of a religious interest such as attaches to no other spot of earth.

The skeptic may sneer at it, but the sneer does not extinguish the fact. There is not a country on earth where idolatry does not exist, in which Jerusalem is not enshrined in the affections of the people, nor a professedly idolatrous land which reveres it. The votary of the Koran, the devotee of the Pentateuch, and the disciple of the New Testament each gives affectionate thought and reverential emotion to Jerusalem. And these are the three books that control the destinies of the world. The only two great rival religious systems, those of India and China, are to-day expiring in the grasp of these.

The pilgrim from Mecca meets in Jerusalem the voyager from the extreme of the Occident, and the inhabitant of Siberia casts the fur from his form, as he jostles in the gate the swarthy Ethiopian or Nubian, who wraps his scanty covering closer round him in the cool night breeze of the Judean hills. And all have come on a *religious* errand. They meet here as upon common ground, and their voices mingle with the sad wail of "the nation without a clime," as the great stones of the temple wall grow daily more smooth beneath the passionate touch of their moist lips.

Whether to be regarded as cause or consequence, it is surely not without significant interest that Jerusalem is thus symbolically

associated with the worship of the one God, and that, as a Shibboleth, it would scarcely shut out a single worshiper. If to the Christian there is not a nameless but a nameful charm beyond all the rest, by so much is he the gainer.

Jerusalem, the city of the Great King, "the joy of the whole earth," "the desire of all nations," (the last phrase most significant of all to-day,) is not only "a city set on a hill," but set upon hills of hills. It is a long weary climb through defiles and over hill-tops, after we leave the plain of Sharon, ere the first sight of *El-khuds;* and this, the first sight to him who comes by way of the Mediterranean, is, perhaps, the poorest of all in some particulars.

The journey is not so intolerable now as formerly, however, for the permanency of Eastern life and custom has given way for once to modern improvement. All who ever rode to Jerusalem by the Yafa road will appreciate the wealth of significance in the statement that there is to-day a road to Jerusalem, from its seaport, practicable for carriages, and above all that an American omnibus makes occasional trips between the two localities. Those who have *not* been there will share in appreciation if they will remember that, excepting the French road from Beirout to Damascus, there is no other in Palestine proper over which a wheeled vehicle can be used.

At a distance of thirty-six miles from Yafa, as the crow flies—a little more by the traveled route—and after having gradually attained an elevation of two thousand six hundred and ten feet above the level of the sea, we at length stand upon a broad ridge, thrown out in a south-east direction from the main range of Judean hills nearly at the water-shed of Palestine. Not far from this the mountain torrent of Wady Surar finds its way, in the wet season, down through that extensive though ribbon-like gorge, until, under the name of Nahr Rubin, it empties into the Mediterranean, while from almost the same point, certainly the same longitude, flow torrents that empty, through Wady Kelt, into the Jordan, or through Wady en-Nar, into the Dead Sea.

This ridge, at its eastern extremity, spreads out into an irregularly-shaped peninsula, which, with the ridge, from a perpendicular bird's-eye view, might not inaptly be compared to the head and neck of an ox in profile, the extremity pointing to the south. With the exception of the part joining it to the neck, it is surrounded on all sides

by deep valleys, called, on the north and east, Kedron or Jehoshaphat; on the south and south-west, Hinnom. At no place, except on the north-west, can it be reached without making the descent of a deep and generally steep, sometimes precipitous, valley. It has a mean length of about two thousand five hundred yards; a mean breadth of about one thousand five hundred, narrowing, at the southern extremity, to less than eight hundred.

Retaining the figure already used, we might say that midway of the connection between head and neck, a slight depression, say three hundred yards broad, begins, pursuing a south-easterly and then southerly course, deepening and narrowing, and longitudinally dividing the head into two parts, of which the easternmost is the largest. Its position very nearly corresponds to the proper position of the division line of the jaws in the figure. This is the valley of the Tyropœon in its lower part, the upper now nameless, but supposed by Dr. Barclay to be the Gihon.

Just where the eyebrow would properly come is another valley, running off to the south-east (or rather *was*, for much of it is now filled up,) and disappearing in Jehoshaphat, which is called in Scripture "the valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes." Another depression starts just opposite the lower part of the neck, and running eastwardly is lost in the Tyropœon. This is scarcely perceptible at the present time.

These surrounding valleys and traversing depressions break the surface into five eminences, which, adhering to our figure, will give Goath directly in the forehead, Bezetha between the eye and the lower jaw, Akra in the lower jaw nearest to the neck, Zion in the extremity of the lower jaw, and Moriah, bearing the Temple inclosure, with its continuation Ophel, occupying the upper jaw from the eye to its extremity.

This peninsula embraces an area of about two million five hundred thousand square yards. The first town within its limits was probably built upon Akra, but the city of David occupied Zion. In the progress of years, however, the city spread through the Tyropœon and over Ophel on the south, and northward and north-east to Jehoshaphat, finally making the entire peninsula one mass of buildings, teeming with population, and, at the time of the great feasts, containing from two to three millions of people.

Under the ravages of successive destructions and readjustments of boundaries, the city has gradually shrunk until, at the present time, it occupies not much over one-third of the peninsula, lying almost in its center. Its shape may be called a distorted parallelogram, of which the Temple inclosure, in the south-east corner, presents the only intact angle, the impulse, in looking at the plan, being to push the deflected sides back to their proper position. In consequence of this deflection the northern and southern sides run in an irregular line from north-east to south-west, while the west side runs in a line also broken from north-west to south-east. The east wall alone is straight.

The walls are quite respectable in character, though exhibiting several phases and eras of building, and, therefore, considerable patching. For the purpose they are intended to subserve, protection from the nomads of the wilderness, I suppose they are amply sufficient, but it would require no very extended siege with Parrott guns to accomplish their breach. They are supposed to occupy at present very nearly the same site as at the time of the Crusades, but the present lines have but few points of coincidence with any one of the three walls existing before the destruction under Titus.

Herod, Hadrian, the Crusaders, and Sultan Suliman have all memorials of their reign in the present wall, the Jewish remains, as is fitting, being the grandest of all. The present height of the walls varies from twenty to eighty feet, according to the character of the ground upon which they are built.

But five gates now supply the place of the great number whose names, given by Nehemiah, Josephus, etc., have furnished bones of contention for the archæologist, and which once adorned the city on its various sides. But four of these five are regularly used, the fifth, Bab el Mugharibeh, being open only in times of scarcity of water, because of its vicinity to Siloam and Job's Well. We might name these, descriptively, the Yafa gate, on the west—the gate of commerce; the gate on the north, the Damascus gate—the gate of political glory; that on the east, St. Stephen's gate—the sacred gate of the Christian; that on the south, Zion gate—the sacred gate of the Moslem; and the fifth, also on the south, the Water gate.

These gateways are massive in structure and not entirely destitute of architectural beauty, although in the latter respect they are

all utterly eclipsed by the gateway, now walled up, on the east side of the Temple area, called the Golden Gate.

Jerusalem must always prove a disappointment to him who goes expecting to find it rich in remains of the past. It is rich in memories and association, surpassingly so, and in those relics of the past, which consist in the unchanged features of nature, the vicinity is wonderfully endowed, but there are but few holy things or localities discernible within the city. Myriads are shown to the traveler, but these are, in almost all cases, the offspring of monkish legends.

A few remains at the Damascus gate, the lower part of the Tower of Hippicus at the Yafa gate, a portion of the wall of the pool of Hezekiah, the Amygdalon of Josephus, Robinson's arch near the south-west corner of the Temple inclosure, the Jews' wailing place a little north, and in other parts of the Temple wall some of the same large stones that render these conspicuous, are about all remaining above ground which can be identified as dating much back of the Crusaders. Under ground, Dr. Barclay, Wilson, and others have explored many vaults, reservoirs, and other substructions which undoubtedly date to very ancient periods, and Lieutenant Warren, under the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund, is pursuing researches which have already thrown much light on several disputed points, and promise much more if but the needful funds are placed at his disposal.

Among other results of his labors, the happy conjecture of Dr. Robinson in regard to the projecting stones near the south-west corner of the Temple wall, has been abundantly confirmed. Lieutenant Warren estimated the span of the arch from the stones still in place, sank a shaft in the bed of the Tyropœon over fifty feet deep, and had the pleasure of finding the foundation stones of the west side of the arch still *in situ*.

He has also, by excavation, demonstrated the position of a portion of the wall of Ophel, running south from the south-east corner of the Temple area, and once inclosing that continuation of Moriah down to Siloam, which is now entirely outside of the city walls. The identification of this wall has an important bearing on the much-disputed question of the exact location and dimensions of the ancient Temple area.

An examination of his reports indicates that the ground, not only

beneath the present city, but under the vicinity formerly included in the ancient walls, is a complete labyrinth of aqueducts, passages, archways, etc., of finished workmanship, and exhibiting a great amount of engineering skill. The wish is almost instinctive, that modern Jerusalem could be carted away, for the revelation of the interesting remains lying beneath.

The modern city has been so built upon piles of rubbish that the making of excavations at many important points is almost impossible from the fears of the inhabitants that their houses may be brought tumbling upon their heads. But for this, the question of the ancient water supply, the relative position of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and the second wall of Josephus, and others, could probably be settled speedily and surely.

The short period of the existence of the Palestine Exploration Fund has been marked by a considerable increase of our knowledge. With all that has been done, however, the topography of ancient Jerusalem is still but poorly ascertained, though every theorizer seems to have equal confidence in his own infallible recipe to reconcile contradictions which, probably, never will be reconciled, and the confidence of each is exceeded only by the absence of generally satisfying conclusions from all.

It is matter of just pride to those of us who know and love him, and especially to those who contributed to the maintenance of his missionary family in Jerusalem, that the work of our own Dr. Barclay, "The City of the Great King," is considered as almost invaluable by those conducting the present excavations. It is styled emphatically "*the* guide book" to Jerusalem, archæologically speaking, and in the many discoveries of the Doctor, furnishes numerous starting points for new explorations.

Notwithstanding the apparent paucity of the *intended* results, we may properly feel that the Jerusalem mission was not a barren enterprise, and other parts of this article will indicate some strong excuses for whatever of failure appeared in its spiritual aspects.

There is one point in which the Jerusalem of to-day is a parallel to the Jerusalem of the past. That is, in the narrowness of the streets, and the compact building of some portions of the city. There has always been a difficulty in properly bestowing the vast numbers given by Josephus within even the extended limits of the old city,

and this difficulty becomes insuperable, unless we give his statements all the advantage which can flow from the consideration of narrow streets, hill-sides where the roofs of one row of houses served as the street of those above, and compactness and height in building.

The Jerusalem of to-day, in an area about one-third as large, has only about one-thirtieth of the population ascribed to the ancient Jerusalem. It is to be considered, however, that even within this circumscribed area there are large spaces of unoccupied ground, and that the Temple inclosure, then swarming with people, is now an almost deserted waste. During the time of the feasts every foot of room was occupied, and tents erected on top of the houses.

The present population probably numbers about twenty thousand, Mohammedan, Jew, and Christian, and a *few* who are neither. Not less than half of these are Jews of the two great divisions, the Sephardim and Askenazim. Between these two classes there exists a very decided antipathy, though they are equally the subjects of antipathy, insolence, and ill-treatment from most of the remaining inhabitants of Jerusalem. Though largest in numbers, they are weakest in influence, and most powerless for self-protection of all the population.

I suppose there is scarcely a country on the face of the earth where they are not held in more esteem, and treated with more of respect, than in Jerusalem. Perhaps this is one of the most significant parts of their punishment by the Almighty, that just where their affections center, just where, nationally, they may most truly use the word "home," just where God, in the days of faithfulness, most highly blessed them, there their affections are outraged, a *true* home is denied, and the curse most visibly manifests itself.

For the Jews of Jerusalem are most wretchedly poor. They groan under a poverty that proclaims itself in dress, in houses, in face, in form. They live daily a life of semi-starvation. A few cents a day each is munificent provision for the mass of them. The unhealthy complexion, the diseased eyes, the shambling gait, mark them out a distinct class of population wherever you meet them, even without the gaberdine and ringlets, which are additionally characteristic. They live herded together in a squalor and filth that are absolutely sickening.

That nothing may be wanting to their misery, their Rabbis rule them with a relentless and unprincipled tyranny, which reduces their

condition to virtual slavery. The Jews of Jerusalem are professional paupers. They live, and expect to live, on the contributions of wealthy and pious Jews in other parts of the world. A residence at Jerusalem is exceedingly meritorious, a death at Jerusalem greatly to be coveted, and an interment in the sacred soil surrounding it better than rubies.

The Jew who dies far from Jerusalem has the unpleasant anticipation that his soul must worm its way under ground through all the soil (and I suppose rocks) that lie between his grave and the Holy City, for only there can its peace be secured, or its destiny ascertained. All this can be avoided by taking himself to Jerusalem before death; hence the Jews who find their way hither. There is also some hook or crook in their theology by which a vicarious residence is made spiritually profitable to him who maintains the proxy. And there are a number of these. But the mass agree in two points, dislike to labor and wretched poverty. Of course, there are some exceptions to this sweeping rule. There are a few who are self-supporting, and live comfortably, but they are emphatically *exceptions*.

But this poverty of body is supplemented and made more horrible by poverty of spirit. A hideous system of immorality prevails in their midst, which, under the sacred name of matrimony, reeks with corruption. An even greater facility of divorce prevails than among their fathers. It is a common thing to see girls not yet sixteen who have been married three or four times, and all their husbands still living. Nothing is easier than to obtain a wife for any period the caprice of the husband may indicate. The present rector of the English Church at Jerusalem stated to me that a large portion of the support of the Rabbis who have right to marry accrues from these frequent marriages and divorces.

They have several synagogues, whose filthy surroundings agree well with their utter want of architectural beauty. The synagogue worship, after the washing of the hands at a bucket of water, with a towel hanging above it, an essential part of the furniture, seems to consist in a rapid reading of portions of the Scripture, invariably accompanied with a swaying of the body backward and forward, which is said to be in fulfillment of a passage of Holy Writ, "All my bones shall praise thee."

The remaining half of the population may be nearly equally

divided into Mohammedans and nominal Christians. Of these last the Greek Church may claim about half, while the remainder are divided as Latins, Armenians, Copts, Abyssinians, and Protestants, with a handful of names not worth remembering.

The religion of the mass of these, omitting, of course, the Protestants, consists of the most degrading superstition and unauthorized practices, characterized by stupendous impositions on the part of the clergy, and servile acceptance thereof as true on the part of the people. There is between them, too, a condition of continual religious warfare, sometimes with the use of secular means, which is surely edifying in the *city of peace*, and professedly under the banners of the Prince of Peace. So high does this warfare rage that it is no uncommon thing for the Turkish guard at the door of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher to be under the necessity of interfering with good sound twhacks to preserve the peace.

The most unsparing ridicule is leveled by each against the miracles, wonders, relics, and holy places of all the rest. Indeed, it is not an inconsiderable aid to correct knowledge of so-called Holy Places, to employ well-informed men of one sect to exhibit and criticise the curiosities of rival sects. You will have the advantage of hearing the negative of the proposition, and may average the counter statements.

Much as we would desire to see the Holy City under true Christian domination, it may well be doubted whether the time has fully come for the eclipse of the Crescent. The removal of the Mohammedan restraining influence would probably lead to a religious war in Jerusalem as terrible, in proportion to the numbers engaged, as the world has ever seen.

The physical condition of the Christians (Latin, Greek, etc.,) is much better than that of the Jews, and even the lower class of Mohammedans. As to their morals, I suppose that Italy will furnish a fair comparison.

Jerusalem is emphatically a religious city, if our standard of judgment is to be the number of religious buildings. On the faithful map now lying before me, I count twenty-two convents within the city limits, each of which has a church attached. In addition to these are the immense Church of the Sepulcher, the English Mission Church, a large number of eleemosynary institutions attached to

convents and churches, the Jewish synagogues, and Mohammedan mosques.

Of all these, the charitable institutions are really the most important; for, uncharitable as it may seem on so charitable a theme, I believe there is very much reason to say that the most powerful and successful converting agency in Jerusalem has been and is the judicious distribution of physical and medical aid, to be indefinitely continued in order to be permanently effective.

The amount of money spent in the midst of the twenty thousand of population, for religious purposes, is simply enormous, and yet it would not be too much to say that Jerusalem is almost as ignorant, to-day, of the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ, as though it had never been proclaimed in the world. It is painful to realize that "the beginning" at Jerusalem is all that we can yet assert of the Christianity of the New Testament in its relations to this Holy City. But we look to the future, and hope.

The Mohammedans of Jerusalem are a piebald assortment of representatives from all the various parts of the Turkish Empire, drawn here by the same religious charm that gathers so many from the four corners of the earth. Jerusalem is one of the superlatively sacred cities of Islam. Neither Jew nor Christian can exceed the fanatic fervor with which the pious Mussulman regards the *Haram esh Sherif*, or Temple Area, or the religious gusto with which his prayers are said in the holy places of El Khuds. The very names he gives it tell his reverence—Beit-el-Makhuddis, "the holy house," etc.

Indeed, so sacred is it that there is one spot in the Mosque of Omar where even the prayer of a Christian dog must bring a favorable answer from Allah; and in the valley of the Kedron, and the west face of Olivet, he locates the assembly of the world for its final judgment by Mohammed, whose seat on that august occasion is shown projecting from the east wall of the Haram. Just *here*, too, is located his spider-web bridge to Paradise, perhaps but an extravagant intensification of the "narrow way" of Christ.

The latter sentence starts a train of thought which I have not space to pursue here, but which I suppose has occurred to every thoughtful observer of Mohammedanism, the evident draughts upon the Christian and Jewish Scriptures by Mohammed in the formation of his system. There are many beautiful things in the Koran, but

it is susceptible of demonstration that all that are vitally and spiritually so are thefts from the Word of God, and these are overlaid and incrusted by an immense mass of stuff having its origin in the insanities of fancy or the demands of passion.

It would not, perhaps, be too much to say that there is scarcely an elaborate (so-called) Christian creed of the present day that does not exhibit a parallelism in this enforced mingling of the human and divine, not in degree but in kind. Nor is there absent from these a common danger that the human may come to be considered of equal authority with the divine.

From the brief review given we have before us this division of population; one half Jews, a fourth Mohammedans, a fourth nominal Christians, perhaps a sixtieth Protestants. It is sad to say it, but truth requires that it shall be said, that with all the enormous outlay of the London Society, the pretentious bishopric that is maintained at great expense, and the occasional parade of figures, the Protestant influence in Jerusalem is a plant of but very sickly growth, and as near *nil* in its bearings upon society as so lavish distribution of *material aid* can allow it to be.

An enthusiastic missionary to Jerusalem has but little idea of the difficulties before him until he actually enters upon the field, and has passed through a course of brain-puzzling and heart-saddening experiences. The population of Jerusalem, in common with that of all Syria, is fearfully depraved. There seems to be, in the great mass, an almost total want of the moral sense, an inability to distinguish between truth and falsehood. Every traveler has found this one of the most prolific sources of trouble and vexation in his sojourn.

It is almost impossible to know when the truth is being spoken by a native upon the most trivial or the most important matters, for falsehood is equally prevalent upon either. Indeed, the Mohammedan makes it a matter of public and unblushing boast that he is more subtile (meaning by that a better liar) than we, and does not hesitate to ridicule Englishmen and Americans for their stupidity in being bound by their word.

The air of Jerusalem reeks with falsehood. It reaches everywhere, from the highest to the lowest, presents itself to Protestant eyes in the most unaccustomed and unexpected phases. It is a component part of the administration of *justice*, has fastened like "a

leprosy in the walls" upon streets, walls, houses, and ruins, enters into every business transaction, forms itself on the lisping lips of childhood, vitiates the profession of religion, and manifests itself in outward prostrations before an unworshiped God.

Yet this was once the center of an earnest worship of the true God, the one beacon light shedding its rays over an ocean of idolatry. Here God dwelt, and spoke, and wrought, and from this as a center have radiated the influences that have given to the civilization of to-day all that is pure, noble, holy, exalted. There is no line of holy, spiritual, or moral influence existing in the world of to-day which, traced back, does not converge with all its fellows in this focal city.

Alas! how terrible are the contrasts of history! Jerusalem is like some blackened, extinct star, which, after having sped its rays of light and beauty out into the universe for ages, goes out in darkness. But its last rays go speeding on, and observers in distant orbs enjoy the light, and say "How beautiful the star!" while itself swings darkling in the abyss of space. Yet may we not hope that, ever speeding onward, the light that went from her may yet again light up the city "beautiful for situation," and she may become holy in fact as in name?

The contrast between the present and past of Jerusalem is not to be found only in her spiritual and moral aspects. It exhibits itself no less commercially, architecturally, mechanically, internationally.

There was a time when the ports of Joppa and Cæsarea, of Tyre and Sidon, were all made tributary to the supply of the wants of the six hundred thousand people, luxuriously living, who made Jerusalem their home. Commerce, in the widest extent of its wanderings to Tarshish and the isles of the sea, was drawn upon to contribute to the pleasures of the chief men of Jerusalem. From beyond Damascus to the north, from India to the east, and Egypt and Ethiopia to the south, flowed into Jerusalem a steady stream of commerce which, under the Roman domination, took in also the further shores of the Mediterranean, and a portion of the interior of Europe.

All commerce necessitates exchange, and there must, of course, have been a great degree of mechanical and agricultural activity in Jerusalem and its dependencies to meet the counter demands of this inflowing stream. The "land flowing with milk and honey" poured the treasures of its production into Jerusalem as its commercial

center, which it continued to be even after the national disruption, and notably so when successive conquests and dispersions had destroyed the distinctions originating in the bold stroke of Jeroboam.

The Jews were not always so averse to mechanical and agricultural labor as they have now proverbially become. Rabbi Judah said, "He that teacheth not his son a trade, does the same as if he taught him to be a thief." The custom was common to give a boy a trade, even if no present necessity existed for its exercise. We may, therefore, regard the population of Jerusalem in ancient times as a busy, thriving collection of artisans and merchants, having large connections with all the accessible parts of the world known to them.

How greatly has the scene changed! The voice of the merchant is silent in her streets, the mechanics are of the rudest, and their skill, such as it is, is drawn upon only for the supply of the simple wants of a half-starved population of twenty thousand. A western community can scarcely realize how simple are the wants of an eastern populace. The bazars of Jerusalem, if not utterly contemptible, yet have nothing that is noticeable. A few expensive goods are found on their shelves for the supply of the Turkish magnates who fatten on even the poor life of this people, but the bulk of articles sold are of the commonest description, and these are not purchased to any considerable extent by an exchange of values produced here, but by money sent to the inhabitants as donations from other parts of the world.

The only branch of mechanics in which there is any noticeable activity is the manufacture of small articles as souvenirs of Jerusalem, from olive, balsam, and other woods, mother of pearl, the bituminous stone of the Dead Sea, etc. The manufacture of these is quite considerable in amount, as every pilgrim desires to carry away some memento of his visit.

Jerusalem is no longer a commercial or manufacturing center to Palestine even for the supply of the limited wants of its present population. Bethlehem and Hebron on the south, and Nabulas and Nazareth on the north, in every thing but the religious aspect, are as truly centers as Jerusalem. In more ways than one, "not one stone has been left on another" of the pride and state of Jerusalem.

The melancholy contrast between the past and present exhibits itself, perhaps, as strikingly in the architectural aspect of Jerusalem

as any other. There was a period when a score of sumptuous palaces, between four and five hundred synagogues, and the luxurious residences of principal citizens and foreigners, furnished a splendid setting from which the magnificent buildings of the Temple area gleamed like a diamond set in virgin gold.

All the vicinity was gorgeous with country-seats of the living, and beautiful sepulchral monuments of the dead. Fountains were playing amid the rich gardens attached to palaces, nature and art vying in the adornment of the city and its fair surroundings. Two splendid bridges spanned the Tyropœon, and another sent its mighty arches down to the very bed of the Kedron. Around the city a mighty wall wound its encompassing folds, with a hundred and ninety massive towers, many of them remarkable for size, and others richly ornamented, while through its grand gateways a stream of representatives from all parts of the known world was constantly passing.

Well might the heart of the pious and patriotic Jew swell within him as he gazed upon its varied splendor. Well might he style it "the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth," this city which had grown from the warlike stronghold of a shepherd chief to proportions and importance so great.

And well may his descendant now exclaim, in the sadness and bitterness of his heart, "How doth the city sit solitary that was full of people! How is she become as a widow! She that was great among the nations, and princess among the provinces, how is she become tributary!" For her house is, indeed, left unto her desolate.

After the destruction of Titus some seventy years, there was a temporary revival of the splendor of the city under heathen auspices, by order of the Emperor Adrian, and, though the holy places were marked by pagan temples, yet, architecturally, the city was probably equal to its former self.

When Constantine espoused Christianity the pagan temples were destroyed or reconsecrated, and Christian buildings still further added to the beauty of the city. Early in the seventh century, however, its architectural ornaments were destroyed by the Persians, though many were rebuilt under Heraclius. Soon after Omar captured the city, but forbore to disturb its public buildings. Fifty years after, the Mosque of Omar was built by the Khalif Abd-el-Melek.

Since that period the work of decay has gone on, with a temporary revival of activity and beautification during the occupancy of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, destined with its fruits to be of but short duration. The wild Kharismian hordes seized and desolated the city about the middle of the thirteenth century, and its beauty has never been restored.

Outside of the Temple inclosure there are but two buildings within the walls which can lay the least claim to architectural elegance. These are the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and the English Church and its adjuncts. Some of the convents and consulates are neatly and solidly built, and a few graceful minarets tower up in various parts of the city. With these exceptions, the city is a mass of solid, ungainly stone buildings, some surmounted by shallow domes, which somewhat break the monotony of the lines, but more with flat roofs, surrounded by a low parapet, pierced in some places to afford a convenient lookout for the women.

The streets, except in the bazars, present a gray expanse of wall, pierced by doorways, sometimes so low that we must stoop to enter, and guarded by strong doors able to stand a siege. In addition to these a few small windows, strongly barred with iron, and in some instances covered with lattice, are seen. The streets formed by such houses as these are necessarily gloomy and lonely in appearance.

All the movements of family life are carried on behind these frowning walls, every large house having an interior court-yard around which the house is built, and from which the inmates derive most of their light and air. Most of the stairways, from floor to floor, are in the open air within this court-yard, which is often ornamented with flowers. The inferior houses, like those of the villages through Palestine, are little more than cubical masses of stone, the plainness of whose architecture is exceeded only by the squalor and filth within.

Within the Temple inclosure the Mosque of Omar has long been a theme of writers who have praised its beauty in the most extravagant terms. It is difficult to imagine whence this great admiration has sprung. The dome is graceful in outline, and the tiles covering the sides of the building are brilliant in color. So also with the coloring of a portion of the interior, though it is generally too dark to obtain the full effect.

But very much of the ornamentation of the interior is puerile, and the interior walls are made up of the fragments of older buildings patched together, with here a molding and there a fragment of *bas-relief*, in a manner that is positively ridiculous. Pillars of different workmanship and different orders are huddled together, and even much of the brilliant tiling upon the exterior has fallen off, giving it a piebald, half-ruinous look that is extremely suggestive as a symbol.

"Ichabod" is written on the walls, not only here, but upon all that is Mohammedan in Jerusalem, and, indeed, throughout the Turkish Empire. Repairing is almost an unknown art here. When the upper story of a Mohammedan's house becomes utterly dilapidated, he removes below, and when this in turn goes, he takes the ground-floor, and when this is no longer tenantable, seeks another. The only part of Jerusalem that looks bright, and fresh, and clean, even comparatively speaking, is that in Christian occupancy.

In one respect Jerusalem, for a city so situated, is well provided, that is, in the supply of water. It is but rarely the people suffer from want of water. In ancient times this was still more notable. During sieges mothers have been found to devour children as food, but none are reported as suffering for water, except in one instance.

Every house of any importance in Jerusalem has its own cisterns. In addition to these there are wells and pools still remaining within and near the city, and still more are known to have existed in former times. Vast quantities of water must have been required by a population of a half million, and when we add to this the immense amount constantly used in the Temple service, the necessary supply becomes colossal.

To him who looks upon the mission of Moses as purely human in its origin and character, there must always remain a question as to the motives moving him, in a wilderness, where the supply of water for the ordinary wants of the people was but scanty, to devise a system of worship to which, in its full establishment, immense quantities of water were absolutely necessary. The fact, however, remains, and the additional fact that the final resting place of that worship was abundantly supplied.

The last fact is, at least, an interesting illustration of the manner in which religious causes many times produce important social and

sanitary results. It is worth more than a passing thought that this mountain stronghold, situate among bleak limestone hills, within whose limits, upon a single passover occasion, two hundred and fifty-six thousand five hundred paschal lambs were consumed, the worshipers probably being as ten to one, was never wanting in the immense supply of water requisite for the wants of so great a multitude. Major Warren estimates the capacity of the reservoirs known to exist under the Temple area at seven millions of gallons. There is much of interesting and suggestive matter upon this theme to be gleaned from ancient writers, both eastern and western, but the purpose of the present article will not allow the space.

It may not be amiss, however, to say in passing, that the assertion, sometimes made by a certain class of controversial writers and speakers, of the difficulty of procuring water in or near Jerusalem for the *immersion* of the three thousand on Pentecost day, is, of all their groundless sayings, the most indefensible. I doubt whether there is a city of modern times, not situated directly on a river or lake, where the performance in question would have been more feasible than at Jerusalem.

The present supply of water is mainly from the large annual rainfall upon the city. This has reached, in one year of observation, eighty-five inches, and in five years, an average of nearly seventy inches. But as this heavy fall is *mainly* within four months, and *entirely* within six, the necessity for cisterns is at once apparent. During six months, say from April to October, there is a rainless, though not a cloudless sky.

The climate is very uniform, the range of the thermometer not being much over 50° Fahrenheit, with an average of less than 70°, and seldom, as extremes, rising above 90°, or sinking below 40°. The south wind, as in Scripture times, brings heat, the Sirocco from that quarter being sometimes intensely hot and remarkably debilitating. The west wind brings rain, though not invariably. Snow sometimes falls, but not to remain long, and there have been exceptional instances of the formation of pellicles of ice an eighth of an inch thick. The rain is frequently accompanied by fine hail, sometimes as large as peas.

On the average the climate of Jerusalem may be set down as delightful, and but for the habits of its inhabitants, it would form a

pleasant residence throughout the year. But these are so utterly independent of and contrary to all sanitary rules as to render it exceedingly unhealthy for Europeans during the summer months.

The markets are supplied with a profuse variety of vegetables and fruits in their season, although doubtless inferior to the olden times, when the besom of desolation had not so often swept the country; the period when rivers ran where now are scanty brooks, and streamlets where now is only the winter torrent; when forests were on the now bare mountain-sides, and luxuriant vines and groves clothed the hill-sides that now exhibit but the rock-hewn supports of the old terraces; when a population of six hundred thousand was as easily fed by the surrounding country as the twenty thousand who now dwell within its walled limits.

But we near the limits of our space, and while regretfully remembering how much remains unsaid that might have been well said even in the cursory view to which we limited ourselves, must console ourselves with the hope that what we have written may be provocative of continued study.

Jerusalem as it was, as it is, and as it is to be, may well form subject of research to the most painstaking antiquarian, and thought to the strongest intellect. Its memories have no rivals in sublime interest. With a history probably dating back to the first group of men who stood upon the earth after the subsidence of the flood, it has been so twined and intertwined with the world's narrative from that time to the present, that to omit it is to take the heart out. No history of Assyrians or Medes and Persians, no chronicle of Egypt, no narrative of Macedonian or Roman conquest is complete without its name.

No history of Europe can be properly written that devotes not many pages to it and its interests; her noblest kings have stood bareheaded at its shrines, and her nobility owe to it the quarterings of their escutcheons. If the sea that washes the shores of its port may be called the Mediterranean, in another sense, and with more of force, may this be called the Mediterranean City. It is not without a sort of poetic truth that the Greek priest marks a spot in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher which he calls the center of the earth.

And if its name is thus intertwined with the mere narratives of the *events* of national life, still more closely does it mingle with the

study of the springs of action for at least eighteen hundred years. From it have radiated the influences that have given the national life of Europe and America all that it has of good.

Of all that distinguishes, favorably, the civilization of Europe and America from that of the Orient, or from their own preceding states, of all that marks man better and woman higher than in the past, of all restoration of stolen rights, of all broadening of human sympathies, of all enriching of home tenderness, of all quickening of conscience and deepening of consciousness, of all approximations to the ideal brotherhood, may be said as truly as of the blessed Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, "beginning at Jerusalem."

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

1.—*Pre-Historic Nations;* or, Inquiries concerning some of the Great Peoples and Civilizations of Antiquity, and their Probable Relation to a still Older Civilization of the Ethiopians or Cushites of Arabia. By JOHN D. BALDWIN, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 414. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE present is emphatically an iconoclastic age. Our reverence for idols is by no means encouraging to those who would perpetuate that kind of worship. And it must be apparent to all thinking men that the time has come when the oracles of tradition can no longer usurp the unmistakable utterances of science. This is as it should be. The world has been governed long enough by dogmatism, and it is now high time that men should be allowed to think.

We should, however, be very careful lest we use this liberty "for an offense." Freedom of thought is not a synonym for licentious thought. Madame Roland, when brought to the guillotine during the French Revolution, said: "Liberty! O Liberty! how many crimes have been committed in thy name!" This is true to human experience, and should teach us the importance of that maxim which says, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

We do not sympathize with the fears of many good men concerning the present controversy between Science and Religion. We want nothing but the truth, and this we must have, if all our cherished systems go to ruin. We only ask that every investigation shall be made in a truth-loving spirit. Our only fear is that the name of liberty will be used by unscrupulous men in the interest of falsehood and slavery. This, however, has been the case during all the great evolutions of society; hence we can not afford to stand still because of this danger. We must go forward. Every interest of humanity demands this; but we must do it cautiously, so that we will not use our liberty "as abusing it."

Perhaps there is no other subject exciting more interest just now than ethnology; and the work of Mr. Baldwin will not be likely to lessen that interest. Few men have written upon the subject with more enthusiasm than

he; and while his work is professedly written for the masses, it will certainly command the attention of the best scholars of the age. The author brings to his work a very extensive information, an intimate acquaintance with all the materials which are now accessible for such an investigation; and if his book does not shake the popular faith in the orthodox chronology, we think it may safely be said that that chronology will stand the test of the present controversy with reference to it.

Mr. Baldwin's theory is, that, of the three great families—the Semitic, Cushite, and Aryan—the Cushite appeared first in the work of civilization; that they were the "original civilizers of south-western Asia; and that, in the deepest antiquity, their influence was established in nearly all the coast regions, from the extreme east to the extreme west, of the old world." He declares that

> "This has been repeatedly pointed out with more or less clearness, and it is one of those incontestable facts that must be accepted. In nearly all the recorded investigations of scholars for the last two centuries, it has appeared among those half-seen facts which dogmatic criticism could treat as fancies without troubling itself to explain them. It could not be otherwise, for, to see and fully comprehend the significance of Cushite antiquity, we must have greater freedom in the matter of chronology, and a more accurate perception of the historic importance of Arabia, than have usually appeared in such investigations. Neither Usher's chronology nor the little country known to the Greeks and Romans as Phœnicia, will suffice to explain that mighty and wide-spread influence of the Cushite race in human affairs, whose traces are still visible from Farther India to Norway." Pp. 18, 19.

It will be seen that this view is in direct antagonism with the orthodox opinion upon the subject. And those who have accepted Usher's system of chronology, and have been accustomed to regard the Hellenic as the oldest civilization, will most likely see in this position of Mr. Baldwin nothing but infidelity. This, however, is no very positive evidence that it is infidelity. Every student of history knows well enough that every innovation upon established religious views has shared the same fate. The history of the Copernican system of astronomy, and the science of geology, furnish abundant illustration. Any thing that proposes to overturn the religious creeds of men will always be greeted with this charge of infidelity. Only a few years ago a reformation was started in this country which proposed to abandon all human creeds in religion, and take the Bible and the Bible alone as a rule of faith and practice. We well remember that this was every-where declared to be infidel, while all the Herods and Pilates made friends in their zeal to put it down. But truth is not put down by such opposition, and this movement is to-day stronger than it ever was before. In fact, it has furnished the leaven which is at present working so effectually in reforming the religious systems of the age. Mr. Baldwin's theory may not be correct, but the cry of infidelity is no longer very alarming to earnest scientific men.

Mr. Baldwin is certainly a bold innovator. To say that the "original Ethiopia was not in Africa, and that the ancient home of the Cushites or

Ethiopians, the starting point of their colonizing and civilizing movements, was in Arabia," is asking us, sure enough, to rearrange our historical data. But it must be confessed that there are many facts which support this view of the matter.

Our author declares that our studies of "ancient history have been embarrassed by two strong but not very wise influences—a false chronology and a false estimate of the Hellenic people in their relation to civilization." It has long been felt that the popular chronology is not equal to the explanation of many facts in history. According to Rollin's chronology, the Assyrian Empire began its career 2,234 B. C., or about one hundred and fifteen years after the Deluge. Now, the Bible informs us that "Noah lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years," that is, two hundred and thirty-five years after the establishment of the Assyrian Empire. Hence he must have witnessed the progress and grandeur of that empire more than two centuries. No wonder Rollin says:

"I must own that I am somewhat puzzled by a difficulty that may be raised against the extraordinary things related of Ninus and Semiramis, as they do not seem to agree with times so near the Deluge; I mean such immense armies, such a numerous cavalry, and such vast treasures of gold and silver, all of which seem to be of later date."

But it is now considered almost certain that there were great monarchies in Asia much older than the year 2,234 B. C. It is contended, with considerable degree of reason, that Egypt existed as a civilized country 5,000 years before the Christian era, and that Menes, who first united all Egypt under one government, began his reign not less than 3,893 years previous to the birth of Christ. With even more certainty, it is declared, that Fuh-hi, the first Emperor of China, lived 4,700 years ago, which period, according to Archbishop Usher, was 508 years before the Deluge. Among the successors of Fuh-hi was Whang-ti. In the sixty-first year of that monarch's reign one of the astronomers of China established the sixty-year cycle, which has been continued to the present time. The seventy-sixth period ended in 1863. Consequently Whang-ti began to reign 2,758 B. C., which, according to Usher, was 410 years before the Flood.

Should any one ask, in reply to all this, what becomes of our *Biblical chronology?* Mr. Baldwin would say:

"The business of constructing systems of 'Biblical' chronology has furnished employment for a large amount of learned ingenuity which otherwise might have been led to write great folios on the word 'Selah' in the Psalms, or to expound the natural history of ancient giants, or to interpret, in a very marvelous way, the prophetic mystery of the Apocalypse. It has been chiefly the work of monks and rabbins, and its relation to historical science is very much like that of conjuring astrology to the science of astronomy. But it is not wholly useless. It has undoubtedly furnished many satisfactions to those whose calling did not afford a more profitable occupation for intellectual activity, or whose learning had not introduced them to a more enlightened study of antiquity. The authority of what is falsely called 'Biblical' chronology is no longer very potent. It can not maintain itself against that

progress of science which constantly increases our knowledge of the past. It must soon disappear, and take its place in the rubbish of the ages, with other legendary absurdities which, in their time, dishonored religion, oppressed the human intellect, and misled honest people by claiming immortal reverence.

"Any system of chronology that places the creation of man only about four thousand or five thousand years previous to the birth of Christ, is a mere invention, a scholastic fancy, an elaborate absurdity. There is nothing to warrant it, and not much to excuse it. Those who profess to find it in the Bible misuse and falsify that book. We may as well seek in the Bible for a perfected science of astronomy or chemistry. It is not there; and no such chronological scheme ever grew out of scientific inquiry. Moreover, there is a remarkable want of harmony among those who have constructed such schemes. The various systems of 'Biblical' chronology claiming attention are at variance among themselves. According to the Jewish rabbins, man was created 3,761 years before Christ; the Greek and Armenian Churches have been taught to say 5,509 years; Eusebius said 5,200; Panadoras, a learned Egyptian monk, having solved the problem with great care and exactness of demonstration, said 5,493; we and the nations of Western Europe have followed Usher, a romancing Archbishop of Armagh, who maintained, with great particularity of dogmatic demonstration, that the human race began to exist on earth precisely 4,004 years before Christ; others have argued, with ingenuity quite as marvelous, to establish the validity of figures different from any of these." Pp. 26, 27.

Mr. Baldwin next attempts to correct what he considers a "false estimate of the Hellenic people in their relation to civilization." Heretofore we have been accustomed to believe that "enlightened civilization, science, and art all began with the people of Hellas, and had their first great development at Athens." He declares that "what belongs to several families of this brilliant group of the great Aryan people has been given to one, and that the latest in development; and what they all received from the Phœnician or Cushite culture, which immediately preceded them in the same regions, has not been well considered."

The remainder of the book brings forward the evidences by which these positions are supported, evidences which, if not always conclusive, have certainly much to commend them to the serious consideration of all earnest men.

It can no longer be doubted that the questions which this volume raises are exceedingly important ones, and can not be set aside by the *ipse dixit* of theological dogmatism. We regret that in discussing them, Mr. Baldwin has frequently shown a dogmatic spirit almost equal to that which he condemns in those who would, *ex cathedra*, uphold the orthodox chronology. These questions can not be settled by ill-tempered or ill-mannered investigation. In dealing with the prejudices of men it is not best to excite those prejudices against us, when it is at all possible to avoid it.

We are not prepared to receive all of Mr. Baldwin's conclusions as entirely satisfactory. In fact, we think many things which he magnifies into difficulties might be made easily to harmonize with the received chronology. Still, as recent discoveries have made a reinvestigation of this whole subject necessary, we only ask that the investigation shall proceed as becomes so

grave and important a matter. With such scholars in this field of inquiry as Max Müller, Rawlinson, Professor Whitney, and Mr. Baldwin, we have every reason to hope that the cause of truth will be the gainer in the end. As we become better acquainted with the Zend-Avesta, the Rig-Veda, the works of Confucius, etc., we have reason to believe that much light will be thrown upon pre-historic nations. The knowledge of *Sanscrit*, and the opening up to commercial intercourse the hitherto walled nation of China, will doubtless lead to many important historical results. Should we be compelled to modify our chronology, it would then be much easier to harmonize the Mosaic record and geology. And if there is nothing incompatible with Bible truth in the change proposed, we do not see where there is any thing to fear should archæological and linguistic discoveries make it necessary.

2.—*Our New Way round the World.* By CHARLES CARLETON COFFIN. Illustrated. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 8vo. Pp. xviii-524. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

IT is seldom that we have read a book of travels with more profound interest than this one. There is nothing in it that is particularly original, but the style is fresh and vigorous, and the author has the happy faculty of saying just the thing that will most likely interest the reader.

Mr. Coffin is a good traveler, though he always sees things through American eyes, and hence can not be trusted too far when discussing the character of civilizations entirely different from ours. He deals some heavy blows at the British on account of their treatment of their subjects in India. He thinks it is not wonderful that Brahmanism and Buddhism do not immediately give way to Christianity, while the latter is represented by despotic Englishmen, who treat the natives as if they were all slaves, and who "curse and swear, get beastly drunk, and do many things repugnant to Hindoo notions of morality and religion."

Notwithstanding the many discouraging things with which the missionaries have had to contend, the number of native Christians connected with Protestant Churches in India and Burmah is placed at about two hundred thousand—the result of missionary effort. This estimate does not include the great number of children acquiring an education in missionary schools, which are acknowledged to be far superior to those established by the government. This is a clever showing considering the difficulties in the way. But the greatest obstacle, after all, in the way of their Christianization, is the strong hold their religious opinions and practices have upon them. Mr. Coffin truly says:

"Theirs is a very ancient religion. For nearly a hundred generations the Hindoo has laved in the sacred waters of the Krishna and the Ganges, and offered his oblations to

images which to him are symbols of Deity. Their sacred books, their traditions, all their habits, their joys, their sorrows, whatever is dear to them in life, or hopeful to them in death, bind them down to idolatry.

"We should not be surprised at their aversion to a religion which sweeps away caste, overthrows idols, subverts the whole order of society, and reduces the sacred Shasters to a fable. Religious convictions, however erroneous, are not readily given up by any portion of the human race."

The degraded condition of woman stands greatly in the way of the conversion of the people to Christianity. The women of India are bound hand and foot by caste. They become wives between five and thirteen, and generally remain in ignorance the rest of their lives. Men can not educate them, for they are not allowed to show their faces to any man except their husbands; hence women missionaries are beginning to educate the women of India as the most certain means of withdrawing two hundred millions of people from gross idolatry.

When he comes to speak of China he is careful to tell us how the English have also hindered the conversion of that people to Christianity. The opium trade is as iniquitous as the African slave-trade, yet it is carried on in the interests of negro-loving England. We are inclined to think that Mr. Coffin does not do England justice when animadverting upon her manners in the East. However this may be, one thing is certain, England has done more toward bringing the Orientals into contact with modern civilization than any other nation; and while her policy has been selfish enough, it is not likely that any other government would have done much better.

After giving us a general view of religion in China, and especially that feature of it which makes the living responsible for the comfort and happiness of the dead, he concludes with the following remarks, which are well worthy of serious consideration at a time when these Celestials are likely to become our most intimate neighbors:

"With this insight into the religion of China, we can better comprehend the reason for the deadness of the empire. The people think constantly of the dead; every motive of action has reference to the reward or punishment they will receive from their ancestors. How can a nation advance while dragging a hundred generations? Their thoughts and aspirations are circumscribed by their slavish fear of the dead. An innovator—a man who does what the fathers did not do—perils the happiness of both the living and the dead. Foreigners are innovators, therefore, to be resisted. Hence all advancement thus far has been made by superior force—by the cannon's argument. Every treaty that has been made with foreign powers has been wrung from a government reluctant to disturb the old order of things. We see why missionaries have such up-hill work, and wonder at what they have accomplished; we see why the Chinese are determined not to have railroads. The empire is a graveyard Railroads are remorseless; they cut through the cities of the living and of the dead alike. A railroad running ten miles in China would disturb the whole spirit realm. Unlucky strokes from spades might sever skulls from vertebræ in some ancestral burial-ground, and then there would be headless ghosts wandering through the land of darkness, and sickness, pestilence, calamity, and untold horrors would settle upon China. Firmness only on the part of the Western nations in the revision of the treaties will forward Christian civilization in this benighted land. China will advance only by pressure from without. The inertia of the mass is too great to move of itself along the path of modern civilization.

When that screeching innovator, the locomotive, begins to move across the plains of this Flowery Land, plowing up old bones, breaking the chains which bind the living to the dead, there will be hope for China. It will yet do for China what it is doing for India. It is a powerful missionary. Idols, caste, prejudices, sacred bulls, Brahmans, customs, religions, laws, governments, dynasties, pashas, mandarins, and kings are borne down by that great leveler. No other agent of civilization can be so potent in these eastern lands, not even the press."

3.—*The Queen of the Air:* being a Study of the Greek Myths of Cloud and Storm. By JOHN RUSKIN, LL. D. New York: John Wiley & Son. 12mo. Pp. viii-178. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THERE is a class of writers who, on account of some happy hit, suddenly find themselves famous. Perhaps they themselves did not dream of the good fortune that awaited them. They had an idea—it was their own—and full of its inspiration, they wrote. The public was pleased, and attested its approbation by purchasing large editions of the new work. This is all very well; but authors have not always discriminated between writing *with* an idea and *without* one. Hence some writers, who have made considerable reputation out of real meritorious works, have frequently injured their reputation by continuing to write when they had nothing very valuable to say. Nothing perhaps marks the history of authorship more than this fact. A large number of popular writers have given us their best works first. In Europe, Charles Dickens is a striking example. "Pickwick Papers," "David Copperfield," and "Martin Chuzzlewit" were really original and meritorious works. But since those were published, Dickens has done little more than reproduce himself. The many volumes he has written have been largely engineered into popular favor on the reputation of his earlier works.

John Ruskin is not an exception to this very general rule. The splendid reputation which he made by the publication of "Stones of Venice," and "Modern Painters," has not been particularly benefited by any thing that he has recently written. Having secured the public attention by the brilliant promise of his youth, he seems to have had little sense of the need of self-restraint and that careful preparation of his works which are so essential to permanent success. Hence he seems to have given himself up, more or less, to exaggeration, to an undue affection for what is called "word-painting." But, notwithstanding this, it can not be denied that he has wonderful powers, and no matter how extravagant he may be, he always commands our admiration for his sincere, noble, and catholic interest in humanity.

The present volume consists of three connected essays, respectively called Athena Chalinitis, Athena Keramitis, Athena Ergane—Athena in the Heavens, in the Earth, and in the Heart. The book is an inquiry into the origin, nature, and functions of the Greek Goddess Athena, who is very

similar to the Egyptian Neith, and not very different from the Latin Minerva. She is,

"Physically, the Queen of the Air, having supreme power both over its breath of calm and wrath of storm; and spiritually, she is the Queen of the Breath of Man. First, of the bodily breathing which is life to his blood, and strength to his arm in battle; and then, of the mental breathing or inspiration, which is his moral health or habitual wisdom—wisdom of conduct and of the heart as opposed to the wisdom of imagination and the brain; moral, as distinct from intellectual; inspired, as distinct from illuminated."

This is the mythical character which Mr. Ruskin has selected, around which to discuss some of the great questions of the day; for after the first two chapters, her ladyship of Grecian mythological notoriety is entirely forgotten by him, while he treats of things entirely distinct from her age, her nation, and her fame. With iconoclastic fury he rushes into the sacred dominion of the gods of *modern society*, and ruthlessly hurls these from their thrones. Democracy is belabored with an evident "malice prepense," while the modern system of wages and labor receives a ventilation which the author evidently regards as healthy. And after having cried

"Havoc, and let slip the dogs of war!"

to his heart's content, he jumps astride his hobby of political economy, and gallops off in a style as brilliant in its rhetoric as it is false in its logic.

Altogether the work is inferior to Mr. Ruskin in his best moods. Still it is interesting, and will doubtless be eagerly read by the many admirers of its brilliant author.

4.—*Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets.* Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher. Illustrated by Anecdotes Biographical, Historical, and Elucidatory of every order of Pulpit Eloquence, from the great Preachers of all Ages. By Edwin Paxton Hood, *Minister of Queen-Square Chapel, Brighton.* New York: M. W. Dodd. 12mo. Pp. 453. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

It would be difficult to understand, from the title of this book, the character of its contents. Nothing but a willingness to pander to the sensational style of the present day could have induced the author to introduce his admirable lectures on preachers and preaching by such a flourish of trumpets.

Let no one suppose, however, that the contents of the volume are as senseless as the title. The author has peculiar fitness for the task he has undertaken, and has given us a work which is not only highly instructive, but is one of the most entertaining books of the kind we have ever read.

He first gives us a definition of a true preacher, then such examples as are best calculated to illustrate his idea. George Fox he considers one of the most stirring trumpets of the Church; Whitefield and Dawson share the like distinction; Richard Watson is taken as an example of the lamp; Lan-

celot Andrews is a model pitcher; while Jonathan Edwards is a splendid embodiment of all three. His definition of a preacher is arbitrary enough, but serves as a kind of guide in discussing the various classes of the profession.

The succeeding chapters present much that is valuable in the history, anecdotes, etc., of the pulpit, beginning with the Jewish Church, and discussing the style of preaching in subsequent ages.

---

5. – *Studies of Philosophy and Theology.* By JOSEPH HAVEN, D. D., *Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary.* Andover: Warren F. Draper. 12mo. pp. 502. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE author of this volume is one of the best thinkers in this country, and as these essays have occupied his most thoughtful hours, they can not fail to interest the class of readers for whom they were written.

The book can not, in the very nature of things, be popular. It treats of subjects for which the mass of men have very little concern. Metaphysics and theology, as such, are becoming less and less popular every day. Our age is too active, and intercommunication too rapid, to allow such subjects to have much hold upon the popular heart. Still there are a few persons in almost every community who will take delight in such a work as Professor Haven has given us. These will welcome his volume, and find in it much that is interesting and profitable.

These essays have appeared in various magazines, most of them in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and are now collected into a volume with such notes as seem to be required.

While the subjects are all treated with marked ability, a few deserve special mention. If we must have the "Doctrine of the Trinity" discussed, then, by all means, let it be done in Professor Haven's clear and masterly manner. "Theology as a Science" is not worth much for practical use, but, if we must have it, we prefer to have the subject discussed in the style of the essay in this volume.

These discussions are claimed to be written not in the interest of any particular form of faith, but as simple and independent investigations of truth, which should ever be the aim of the Christian scholar. The volume is divided into two parts, and discusses the following themes:

"PART I. *Studies in Philosophy:* 1. Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton; 2. Mill *versus* Hamilton; 3. The Moral Faculty; 4. The Province of Imagination in Sacred Oratory; 5. The Ideal and the Actual.

"PART II. *Studies in Theology:* 1. Natural Theology; 2. The Doctrine of the Trinity; 3. Theology as a Science—its Dignity and Value; 4. Place and Value of Miracles in the Christian System; 5. Sin, as related to Human Nature and the Divine Mind; 6. Arianism—the Natural Development of the Views held by the Early Church Fathers."

6.—*The Life of John James Audubon, the Naturalist.* Edited by his widow. With an introduction by JAMES GRANT WILSON. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 12mo. pp. 443. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

JOHN JAMES AUDUBON was one of the most remarkable men of his age. For sixty years or more he followed, with a religious devotion, the study of ornithology. Through all climates, exposing himself to all kinds of dangers, suffering all kinds of privations, he entered upon his work with an enthusiasm which no defeat could subdue, and no obstacle discourage. Truly did Christopher North say of him: "He is the greatest artist in his own walk that ever lived;" and we do not wonder that Baron Cuvier should pronounce his works to be "the most splendid monuments which art has erected in honor of ornithology."

This volume is an affectionate tribute to his memory by his widow. For the most part, the work is well done, and will be welcomed by the admirers of this heroic man both in this country and Europe. The book is largely made up of extracts from Audubon's journal, and this gives to it a freshness and interest which it could not otherwise possess. In the preface to the London edition of the work, we have the following striking pen-portraits of the man and his wife:

"Audubon was a man of genius, with the courage of a lion and the simplicity of a child. One scarcely knows which to admire most, the mighty determination which enabled him to carry out his great work in the face of difficulties so huge, or the gentle and guileless sweetness with which he throughout shared his thoughts and aspirations with his wife and children. He was more like a child at the mother's knee than a husband at the hearth—so free was the prattle, so thorough the confidence. Mrs. Audubon appears to have been a wife in every respect worthy of such a man; willing to sacrifice her personal comfort at any moment for the furtherance of his great schemes; ever ready with kiss and counsel, when such were most needed; never failing for a moment in her faith that Audubon was destined to be one of the great workers of the earth."

7.—*Sermons by the* REV. THOMAS HOUSE TAYLOR, D. D., *for many years Rector of Grace Church, New York.* New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 8vo. pp. 376. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

IF superior taste in the mechanical part of a book were a sure passport to the book's immortality, then this volume could "read its title clear" to a never-ending fame. But it requires something more than mechanical completeness to give a book a permanent place in the literature of a country. We do not wish to be understood as intimating that Dr. Taylor's volume of sermons has no literary value or intellectual force. The sermons are about equal in style and thought to the best of the class to which they belong. We can not say very much, however, for the class. Fashionable pulpits such as Dr. Taylor filled are not likely to stimulate much religious or mental activity. And if we occasionally find some fine passages in his sermons,

they but tell us what he might have accomplished had he had a different congregation to wait on his ministry. His style is smooth enough, and his thoughts are generally compactly and naturally placed together, but his sermons lack enthusiasm—the language *con amore*, which can alone carry conviction to the hearts of men, and lead them to seek an interest in the blood of the crucified Savior.

We can not conceive that these sermons produced any visible effect upon the congregations to whom they were delivered. Hence, studied as sermons, they fall very far below a true standard; but as they are now collected in book form, if we read them as essays, we will find much in them that is worthy of a high religious culture and an earnest religious heart.

8.—*Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.* Prepared by Rev. John M'Clintock, D. D., and James Strong, S. T. D. Vol. II. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 933. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

This Cyclopœdia embraces a wide range of subjects, and, so far as published, is edited with fairness and ability. It is not as thorough in its treatment of many subjects as Kitto and Smith, but it is far better adapted to popular use than either. It is more thoroughly American, and more fully up to the times.

A first-class cyclopœdia on the plan of this one is very much needed. We have nothing that exactly meets the popular demand—one that is suitable alike to the preachers and people; the learned and unlearned. Should this one be faithful to the promise it gives in the first two volumes, it will be an exceedingly valuable addition to our theological literature.

There are several articles in the second volume that are worthy of special mention. The one on "Chronology" is very exhaustive, and presents much that is useful upon that subject. The one on "Divination" will also be found highly interesting, and of great value. The sketches of eminent religious men are generally well written, and fairly present the leading points of their characters. A clever sketch of Alexander Campbell closes thus:

"Dr. Campbell was highly endowed as an orator; a noble presence and a powerful voice gave effect to his vigorous thought and fluent, energetic speech. Vast audiences gathered to hear him in his journeys through the West."

9.—*Credo.* Boston: Lee & Shepard. 12mo. pp. 444. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

This volume belongs to a class of works which have recently met with great popular favor. In no department of religious thought has there been more activity than that which discusses the natural and supernatural. The contest between Rationalism and Christianity is widening and deepening,

and every book which ably discusses the issues between these will be sought for with great eagerness.

"Credo" is, in some respects, an able work, and meets the skepticism of the day with brave and earnest words. It discusses, first, the "Supernatural Book;" next, "Supernatural Beings;" third, "Supernatural Life;" and lastly, "Supernatural Destiny." Under these heads the author vindicates the Bible and what are called Evangelical Doctrines with considerable ability. Still, it is unfortunate for the work that the author should allow his denominational views to obtrude themselves upon the public through a book that ought to have been free from all sectarian bias. We do not object to his being a Methodist, but we do not regard a defense of Methodism as exactly equivalent to a defense of the Bible; nor should we deem it necessary to adopt Rationalism as a system, though Methodism should turn out to be an unnecessary thing.

We are glad to witness the interest which is every-where manifest in the re-examination of the grounds of the Christian faith. We have no fears for the result, *provided* the contest is confined to the issues between primitive Christianity and infidelity. But we have not much hope that any one will be able to defend modern sectarianism against the vigorous attack of a vigilant and active Rationalism.

10.—*Realities of Irish Life.* By W. Stewart Trench. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 297. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

It is seldom we meet with a book whose title-page so exactly describes the contents. We doubt whether any book has ever appeared from the press which more faithfully describes Irish character than this one. And to say that it is thrillingly interesting does not, we think, overstate the case.

The book is a discussion of Irish passions and Irish wrongs, and the treatment is in a style as forcible, as full of humor and pathos as any thing Dickens ever wrote in his best and earliest works. It describes events in the personal experience of the author, events so extraordinary, that were it not that they are attested as indisputable facts, it would be difficult to believe that such things could happen in the present age. The work is, indeed, an apt illustration of the oft-repeated statement that "truth is stranger than fiction."

Just now there is a new interest manifested in the Irish people. The recent controversy in the British Parliament on the Irish Church question, and the final passage of the Disestablishment Bill, have awakened a profound interest in one of the most remarkable races on the European continent. Hence, we doubt not that this book of Mr. Trench will be eagerly read, especially in this country, where Irish struggles for freedom have always challenged the deepest sympathy of our liberty-loving people.

11.—*David, the King of Israel;* a Portrait drawn from Bible History and the Book of Psalms. By FREDERICK WILLIAM KRUMMACHER, D. D. Translated under the express sanction of the author by the REV. M. G. EASTON, M. A. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 518. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

DR. KRUMMACHER is far from being a brilliant writer. In fact, he is sometimes almost dull. Then there is that inevitable prolixity which always characterizes German authors, and which, in his case, is all the more unbearable, because it is not relieved by much that is vigorous and sprightly.

The word *piety* is the key which unlocks to us the peculiarity of Krummacher's mind. You can not come in contact with his writings without being affected by his deeply religious nature. In this fact lies the value of his works. And in this day of sensational writing, when calm, earnest, heart-life is at a discount, it is quite refreshing to meet with such a work as the one before us.

"David, the King of Israel" is a valuable contribution to religious literature in this country, and the publishers are entitled to the thanks of religious people for giving us the work in such an attractive American dress. It is certainly not a promising book to sell, for it has few characteristics in harmony with the prevailing popular taste. It is, however, all the more welcome on that account.

12.—*The Closing Scenes of the Life of Christ;* being a harmonized combination of the four Gospel histories of the last year of our Savior's life. By D. D. BUCK, D. D., with an Introductory Essay by W. D. WILSON, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 293. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THIS work is intended to give, in a convenient form, a connected view of the *personal history of Christ*, and especially of the year preceding his crucifixion. We believe it is Dean Alford who said that a complete and intelligible harmony of the Gospels is impossible, and we are inclined to think that this remark is more than half true. Still, that something valuable may be done in this way must be admitted, and we know nothing better for what it proposes than the work of Dr. Buck. It is evidently a work of much diligence, patience, and perseverance, and is both curious and convenient to the student of the New Testament.

The plan is simple, but evidently required an immense amount of labor to carry it out.

1. There is a combination into one harmonious and continuous narrative of every idea expressed in the four Gospel histories of the period designated.

2. In all cases the original expressions, as found in the authorized version of the New Testament, are retained.

3. By superior figures, 1, 2, 3, 4, incorporated with the Scripture text, it can be discovered from which of the several Gospel records the words, sentences, verses, and paragraphs have been selected.

There are a number of other points of interest, but these will sufficiently indicate the character of the work.

13.—*The Gates Wide Open;* or, Scenes in Another World. By GEORGE WOOD. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 12mo. pp. 354. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

As to what heaven really is, we know but little. What the Bible teaches upon the subject may be generalized as follows: *Heaven is a place of perfect happiness.* As to the exact elements of which this happiness is composed, or the exact employment that shall give it expression, the Bible is by no means clear. Every man has his own idea as to what these things are. To the sad, weary heart, whose life has been a severe toil, heaven seems a place of release from labor; to one who has experienced much sorrow, it is simply a place where all tears will be wiped away, etc. Of one thing, however, we are assured; to all of us who are worthy of heaven, it will be worthy of us, and will fill us with boundless felicity throughout eternity.

Recently there has been a new interest created in this whole subject by the publication of Miss Phelps's "Gates Ajar," a book which has had an almost unprecedented popularity. We now have "The Gates Wide Open," a very readable book, and one which will doubtless be eagerly sought by those who have been interested in Miss Phelps's work. It is proper to say that "The Gates Wide Open" is a new title for a book published in 1858, by Derby & Jackson. The book then had a very limited circulation, under the title "Future Life; or, Scenes in Another World." It is now published in handsome style, and may be read with interest and profit by all.

14.—*Sacred and Constructive Art; its Origin and Progress.* A Series of Essays. By CALVIN N. OTIS, *Architect.* New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 12mo. pp. 305. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THIS book is deserving of a much wider popularity than it is likely to have. In composing it, the author has had a practical object in view, to place before the public the cause, origin, nature, and object of constructive art. A work of this kind, well executed, must be of great value, for no such work has before been attempted. The author does not aspire to a literary reputation, but seeks to bring before the public, in a clear and simple style, a subject which has for many years engaged his attention. We think it will be generally conceded that he has written a very readable and useful book; one which will doubtless lead to more elaborate and satisfactory works upon the subject of which it treats.

15.—*The Wonders of Optics.* By F. MARION. Translated from the French, and edited by CHARLES W. QUIN, F. C. S. Illustrated. 16mo. pp. xii–248.

Thunder and Lightning. By W. DE FONVIELLE. Translated from the French, and edited by T. L. PHIPSON, Ph. D., F. C. S. 16mo. pp. xvi–216.

The Phenomena and Laws of Heat. By ACHILLE CAZIN, *Professor of Physics in the Lyceum of Versailles.* Translated and edited by ELIHU RICH, editor of Griffin's "Cyclopœdia of Biography," and "Occult Sciences;" late editor of "The People's Magazine," etc. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 16mo. pp. xii–264. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THESE works have had an unprecedented popularity in Europe, and it is likely they will meet with as hearty reception here as there. Just now, when scientific questions are engrossing so much attention, it is well to have the popular mind instructed upon the leading subjects of science. These books are fully up to the times, and treat, in an easy, popular style, the most difficult problems of nature. They are copiously illustrated, and can not fail to interest the general reader as well as the earnest student.

16.—*The Bible Hand-Book;* an Introduction to the Study of Sacred Scripture. By JOSEPH ANGUS, D. D. Second revised edition. With revisions, notes, and an index of Scripture texts. By REV. F. S. HOYT, A. M. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton. 8vo. pp. 781. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

WE welcome this new edition of this truly invaluable work. In the present edition all the known errors in typography and in the Scripture references have been corrected; also many statements which criticism has proved to be unfounded, or to require modification. Altogether it is now one of the best works of the kind in any language, and should be in the hands of every student of the Living Oracles.

17.—*An American Woman in Europe.* The journal of two years and a half sojourn in Germany, Switzerland, France, and Italy. By MRS. S. R. URBINO. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 16mo. pp. 235. 1869.

THIS is really a guide-book of Europe, and is quite unlike most books of travel. It gives you just the information you need, should you contemplate a visit across the Atlantic. The book is well worth a careful reading, though its value consists chiefly in its notice of those smaller things which are generally overlooked by travelers.

18.—*Men, Women, and Ghosts.* By ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS, author of "The Gates Ajar," etc. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. vi–334. 1869.

IT would be difficult to tell why this volume was published, unless it was to sell on the reputation of the "Gates Ajar." It lacks the individuality of that book, and is not remarkable for any thing, unless it be the want of affinity between its title and its contents.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

19.—*Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Deutschland. Neuere Zeit.* VIII *er Band. Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland seit dem Anfange des* 19. *Jahrhunderts mit einem Rückblick auf die früheren Zeiten. Von* THEODOR BENFEY. (History of the Sciences in Germany. Modern Period. Vol. 8. History of the Science of Language and Oriental Philology in Germany since the beginning of the 19th century, with a retrospective glance at the earlier periods. By THEODORE BENFEY.) Munich: 1869. 8vo. pp. x–836.

THE world owes the suggestion of this great work to the historian Leopold Ranke and the practical initiation of it to King Maximilian II of Bavaria, whose royal munificence made it possible to put the magnificent plan into operation. It was an undertaking not only of national but of world-wide importance, and the name of its generous patron, who did not live to see even the first volumes of the work appear, will be forever linked with the history of the sciences in Germany. The first scholars of the land have been united under the direction of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, for the purpose of carrying out the project so grandly begun. There are to be separate histories of all the following departments of science: Catholic Theology, Protestant Theology, Philosophy, Æsthetics, Classical Philology, German Philology and Archæology, Oriental Philology (including the Science of Language), History, Military Science, Jurisprudence, Politics and Political Law, Political Economy, the Science of Agriculture and Arboriculture, Geography, Technology, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Medicine, Zoölogy, Botany, and Mineralogy. The first volume, containing the History of Political Law and of the Science of Politics by Professor Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, was issued in the year 1864, and has been followed at intervals by the History of Mineralogy by Professor Von Kobell, of Munich; the History of the Science of Agriculture and Arboriculture by Professor Fraas, of Munich; the History of Geography by Dr. Oscar Peschel, of Augsburg; the History of Protestant Theology by Professor Dr. Dorner, of Berlin; the History of Catholic Theology by Professor Werner, of St. Pölten; the History of Æsthetics by Professor Lotze, of Göttingen, and finally by the volume whose title stands at the head of this notice.

Concerning the author, we have only to say that he is one of the most eminent Orientalists and comparative philologists in Germany, which means in the world. He has been for the last thirty years and more identified with the whole forward movement in philology. And what a movement it has been! As chemistry is to alchemy, as astronomy to astrology, so is the

modern science of language to the philology of the last century. It is true, less has been said and less is known of the brilliant discoveries in the domain of the intellectual sciences than of the progress made in the various departments of physical science, but it is entirely safe to say that the advance in the former has been, comparatively, greater even than in the latter. This, of course, can not be shown in a brief notice like the present, but the fact is patent to all who choose to investigate, and those who deny it, do it at the peril of demonstrating their ignorance. To all who desire information as to the history and present state of philological science in particular we heartily recommend Professor Benfey's masterly and noble work. As a specimen of the impartial manner in which the whole subject is treated, we commend the following, which we translate from the section on "The Influence of Christianity on the Promotion of the Science of Language," to the attention of those sapient individuals who are always braying about the Christian religion being inimical to the progress of the sciences.

The author shows us how the narrow views of the Hindus, Greeks, and Romans retarded the development of philological science among them, and rightly remarks that by their enmity toward other languages they were prevented even from thoroughly understanding their own and cut off from effectually entering upon the higher problems of language. It was only through the greatest possible extension of the knowledge of languages that the horizon of the science could be so enlarged as to make real progress possible. But, he says:

"The whole spirit of classical antiquity was opposed to this. The foreign languages with which it came in contact, branded as they were with the name 'barbaric,' were disregarded, except for practical ends and in ethnological questions, in the determination of national affinities; in the scientific aspect they were treated with indifference. Even Greek and Latin, although taken cognizance of mutually by Romans and Greeks, do not appear to have reached, among either the former or the latter, an international treatment—Greek in the Latin language for Romans and, *vice versa*, Latin in the Greek language for Greeks. This disregard for the barbarian languages found also a certain justification in the rapidity with which they yielded to the encroachment of Roman and Greek culture, and either wholly disappeared or came near disappearing

"Under Alexander the Great and his successors the Greek dominion had been extended into India. The Greek language had become lodged in Egypt, and in the western part of the empire of the Seleucidæ, as the language of the educated, and had spread much further, as the vehicle of a higher culture, in Asia as well as in Europe and Africa. Kings of Parthia were in Crassus' time familiar with the Greek language, and a king of Armenia, Artavasdes, wrote orations, history, and even tragedies in Greek. In short, the power of Greek culture was so great in a large part of western Asia and Egypt, and increased to such an extent under the dominion of the Eastern Empire, that if there had not been a special obstacle the original languages would probably have disappeared just as they did in Thrace, Illyria, Spain, and Gaul.

"And yet, even in the period of classical antiquity, a strong foundation was laid for the reception of the non-classical languages into the domain of philology; not, however, by the representatives of the classical spirit; that great event, which transformed the whole way of thinking in that period—the creation of Christianity, bore also this most important expansion of the science of language in its bosom.

"Wherever a language possessed of vital vigor had still sustained itself in the mouth of the people proper, Christianity not only afforded powerful resistance to its further decadence, but also caused it to become fixed in literature, even to attain to a certain florescence, at least to leave behind enough of a literary character to enable modern philology to obtain a knowledge of its then condition. This is attributable principally to the fact that Christianity, into whatever country it penetrated, addressed itself not merely to the educated, but also, and that pre-eminently, to the humbler classes of the people; in which circles it also made the most numerous and most decided conquests. It became thereby a necessity for it to make use of the languages of the common people. As in the beginning of its history—in glaring opposition to Islam—it could not propagate itself by force of arms, but only by the power of the Word, particularly of its sacred writings, it was obliged to do what the Mohammedan held to be useless, nay, impossible, criminal—to translate them into the languages of all the peoples to whom it came. By this means they obtained in their own language books, which, in consequence of the unity of the Christian communities, were sacred alike to the educated and the uneducated among the members thereof, and therefore brought even the educated back to the use of the language of the people. No sacred language was opposed, among Christians, to the others with an exclusiveness similar to that exercised by the classical languages; all the nations that accepted Christianity received sacred Scriptures in their several tongues, which were thereby in a certain sense themselves made sacred. As by Christianity all men were placed on an equality, so all languages, and thereby the spell was broken which threatened to prove so prejudicial to the further development of the science of language.

"Thus we owe, even to the first centuries of Christianity, the development of a Coptic, a Syriac, an Armenian, a Georgian, and an Ethiopian literature, together with the most ancient monument of our mother tongue—the Gothic translation of several parts of the sacred Scriptures. The beginning of ancient Irish literature—the oldest remains of the Celtic language—although not accompanied by a translation of the Bible, we also owe to the influence of Christianity; so the beginnings of Anglo-Saxon literature are connected with a translation of sacred writings, and such a translation also stands at the head of the Slavic literature. It is true the Roman Catholic Church, in which Latin had been established by Gregory VII as the ecclesiastical language, placed obstacles greater or less in the way of a dissemination of the Bible in the vulgar tongues. On the other hand, an all the more powerful effort was made to this end among the Protestant Confessions, and since the organization of the first English Bible Society, (March 7, 1804, in London,) which was followed by many others on the continent, the movement has increased to such an extent, that there will soon be but few nations in existence, for whom it will not be possible to read the Holy Scriptures in their own language: an activity, the consequences of which are, at any rate, not less beneficent in the expansion of philology than in the propagation of Christianity.

"Yet the extension of this tendency of Christianity to a direct promotion of the science of language through more exact, grammatical treatment even of uncultivated tongues, into which the sacred Scriptures were translated, belongs to a much later period. In that of which we now speak it is limited essentially to the preservation of several vulgar tongues, and the literature growing out of them looks only to the service of the Church. A literature transcending these limits and, to some extent, even grammatical treatises, sprung up only in those circles which were more remote from the centers of culture in this period, or which had become estranged through religious factions—in Syria, Armenia, and Ethiopia. The astonishing Gothic translation, the work of a man of undoubtedly great philological gifts, was accompanied neither by a Gothic grammar nor a lexicon. It was only a necessary expedient for the instruction of the uneducated, of those who were unacquainted with the cultivated languages of that period—the Greek and Latin. These remained, even after the destruction of the Western Empire, the languages of the Church and of general culture. When the Goths allowed themselves to be mastered by Roman culture, there were no longer even copyists enough to be found in order to transmit entire to the future this work, so important for those who were soon to be the rulers of nearly all Europe.

"Thus this tendency of Christianity was in its beginnings of preponderant *extensive*

importance to the science of language; still, another factor came in, to which we must ascribe a preponderant *intensive* value.

"From the fact that Christianity proceeded out of Judaism, stood in most intimate connection with its sacred writings, was essentially built upon it, Judaism was also drawn into the sphere of culture which began to develop itself on the basis of Christianity. The interpretation of the sacred writings in their original text became of continually increasing importance, and in consequence thereof the Hebrew language took an equal, yes, in virtue of the sacredness of their contents, a pre-eminent position beside the classical languages, which had hitherto alone been treated scientifically. The domain of philological study was thus extended toward a language which, belonging to a family entirely different from the classical languages, standing over against them as wholly foreign, would necessarily contribute not a little toward transforming the views based on those languages concerning general linguistic questions, even toward demonstrating them to be erroneous.

"But not alone in virtue of their peculiar language were the sacred Scriptures of importance in the further development of the science of language, but also in virtue of their contents.

"The conviction prominent therein, of the descent of all men from a single human pair, of the original unity of all languages, the myth concerning the division of the primitive language into different tongues, which was long an article of faith, could not but exert a powerful influence on the most important problems of philology—in particular, regarding the origin of language, whether through human wisdom, according to Philo, or through reason, (the λογικὴ δύναμις ἐντεθεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων,) according to Gregory of Nyssa, or, as the opponents maintained, in a special manner through God, (ὃ θεὸς ἔθετο τὰς προσηγορίας τοῖς οὖσι,) and could not but, in defending or refuting them, afford to linguistic inclinations and powers a lasting and extensive arena for the exercise of their skill in arms.

"The Jews, so long as they were independent, did not particularly distinguish themselves either by scientific or social development. Their intellectual creations are limited more especially to the domain of religion, as indeed the high position, which they take in the history of human culture, is essentially based upon the fact that they are, as far as their history reaches, the supporters of the idea of one only God and of that strict morality which proceeds from this idea; in other words, the representatives of religion and morality, which with the other nations of antiquity were dissevered from each other, but with them folded into the most intimate union—in a certain sense the religious nation *par excellence*. It was only after they had forfeited their independence, that they, in the dispersion, in contact with other nations, developed an intellectual activity, by means of which they were enabled, where they were not hindered by force, or oppressed, not only to vie with the nations among whom they lived in the progress of their culture, but sometimes to take a pre-eminent position.

"One of their chief merits consists, however, above every thing else, in their having, in spite of all the suffering and persecution which fell to their lot in almost every period, preserved their sacred writings, and in never failing to contribute, so far as circumstances permitted, to the faithful conservation and restoration of the text and interpretation thereof. In making the latter accessible to the unlearned they were the predecessors of Christianity, and won the glory of having instituted, if not, so far as known, the first translation of a voluminous work—this ought according to recent researches perhaps to be ascribed to the translators of the Zoroastrian writings into the Pahlavi tongue—yet at least the second. This was the Greek translation of the Holy Scripture, which was composed in the third century before our era, in the Macedonico-Attic dialect, for the use of the Jews in Egypt, who were unacquainted with Hebrew, and is known by the name of the Septuagint. It is based on a Hebrew text which preceeded the later and better revision of the original. It nevertheless attained in the Egyptian Jewish circles to great authority, and almost entirely took the place of the original text, so that both Philo and Josephus make use of it by preference. It attained a still greater importance among Christians; but by this very means the attention of the Jews was attracted to the manifold discrepancies between it and the then received text of the original. In consequence thereof a new, slavishly correct Greek translation was made in the course of the second century of our era by Aquila, which was soon

followed by a revision of the common Greek text by Theodotion and a freer translation by Symmachus. This demonstrated to the Christians the necessity of going back to the Hebrew original, as is evident already in Origen and afterward in Jerome. Thus the Hebrew language was made an essential part of Christian science, and for *the future* at least an eminent place was secured to it in the domain of philology.

"On the other hand, the promotion, or rather the securing of a future science of language, through the influence of Christianity, became almost directly evident in another direction. Its influence in this direction ran through the whole medieval period in Europe, not infrequently illuminating the profound darkness by a magic twilight, and served almost as the most essential factor in preserving that tenuous thread, which, threatening every moment to break, was destined to unite the ancient with the modern culture, and which, by not breaking quite asunder, made the rapid and high development of the latter possible.

"With the spread of Christianity to those nations which did not belong to the Roman empire, were spread in greater or less degree those languages in which it had received its development hitherto, and in which its fundamental writings were composed. These were especially the Latin and Greek, and in a lesser degree also the Hebrew. With by far the greater number of the European nations the Latin language took the first position; the Bible was put into their hands in Latin, the language of the Church was Latin, and in this language most of the works which related to Christianity were written. Every one who in virtue of his calling occupied himself with Christianity was therefore of necessity driven to acquire a knowledge of this language. Inasmuch as whatever of science had been preserved was mainly, nay, almost altogether, cultivated by the clergy, Latin became also the language of science, and had therefore to be learned also by the few who, outside of this circle, were controlled by a scientific impulse. Thus the knowledge of Latin not only extended itself in a comparatively large circle, and was preserved, but it was also, in part at least, cultivated with earnestness and zeal. A multitude of writings, of the most various character, in prose and poetry, were composed in it, and in glosses and grammatical compendiums—to which we owe no little knowledge of the then condition of the European languages, particularly of the Irish and of our mother-tongue, as also of medieval affairs in general—the means of learning it were deposited. Hereby, on the one hand, an impulse was given, in spite of the occasional stringent prohibition of the reading of classic authors, to preserve the treasures of the Latin language, and to multiply, by copying, the number of manuscripts, even when they did not relate to ecclesiastical life; on the other hand, the taste for the grammatical treatment of a foreign language in the mother-tongue was awakened, and probably already somewhat strengthened.

"The Greek language, indeed, retired more into the background, yet it also continued to attract attention, at least in a general way, as the source of the original text of the New Testament; in the Byzantine empire, in Italy, and in other scattered localities, there was opportunity to learn it, and the interest awakened in it was at any rate sufficient to prevent also the Greek manuscripts from being wholly neglected.

"The Hebrew language, notwithstanding the reverence for it as the primeval language, (Vide Origen and Jerome,) fell with the increasing darkness of the middle ages naturally—particularly after the fifth century—wholly into the background. The preservation and multiplication of the Hebrew text of the Holy Scripture was committed to the Jews, where it was in good and faithful hands.

* * * * * * * *

"A direct promotion of the science of language in the European middle ages is therefore hardly to be demonstrated. Nevertheless, it is not to be denied that by the very attention to, nay, the reverence for foreign languages, which was, in complete contrast to classical antiquity, implanted in them by Christianity—a reverence which, resting upon a religious basis, promised through an acquaintance with the wonderful works preserved in them to develop into a purely human love—the liking for and the tendency to general linguistic researches were so prepared for, that they were enabled at a later period to unfold themselves into the mighty scientific impulse, which has led in our day to the most remunerative results."

20.—*Sprache und Schrift. Das Lautdenken für Ohr und Auge. Freunden der Literatur und Sprachwissenschaft, insbesondere der studirenden Jugend, gewidmet von* Dr. Karl Böttger, *Professor am Gymnasium zu Dessau. Mit in den Text gedruckten Illustrationen.* (Speech and Writing. Thinking perceptible to Ear and Eye. Dedicated to Friends of Literature and Philology, especially to Young Students. By Dr. Karl Böttger, Professor in the Gymnasium at Dessau. With illustrations printed in the Text.) Leipzig: 1868. 8vo. pp. viii—134.

Die Sprache und ihr Leben. Populäre Briefe über Sprachwissenschaft von Dr. August Boltz, *früher Professor der russischen Sprache an der Königlichen Kriegs-Akademie zu Berlin.* (Language and its Life. Popular Letters on Philology. By Dr. August Boltz, formerly Professor of the Russian Language in the Royal Military Academy of Berlin.) Leipzig: 1868. pp. ix—149.

There is a disposition, now every-where apparent, to popularize the results of scientific research. This is the case not only in our own country, in England and France, but (which will be a matter of surprise to many) to an even still greater extent in Germany. In that land, which is popularly regarded as the native soil of Mr. Carlyle's Dryasdust, where the dreariest learning has been thought to be the daily bread of scholars, and misty, bottomless speculation the peculiar atmosphere of all philosophical intellects, where letters and the sciences were confined exclusively to an aristocracy of the mind, there is, now at least, a universal restless desire to make the whole people partakers of the best culture of the age, and therefore a perfect deluge of books and pamphlets, often written in the most elegant and entertaining style, on all possible subjects of human thought and investigation. And candor compels us to confess that they are, as a rule, far superior to most of the productions of a like character published here or in England. The books written in English are almost always either too large or too dull, or both, to suit the purpose of popular instruction. Of late years several treatises have been published, both here and in England, intended to serve as popular introductions to the modern science of language, as based upon comparative philology. With the exception, perhaps, of the little work of Mr. Farrar, on "the Origin of Language," they have all missed the mark aimed at, by forgetting that when writing for general instruction *multum in parvo* is the rule.

We have rarely seen a book which, in the treatment of its subject and the distribution of the materials, approached so near to the ideal of a work for popular instruction as the first of the two above-named, by Prof. Böttger, the German translator of Max Müller's Lectures on the Science of Language. A thin volume of one hundred and thirty-four pages, and yet all the essentials treated. The book was written for youthful students, for children, but may be studied with profit also by the majority of "children of a larger growth." "It must," says the author, "be a source of high

enjoyment to every mind striving for a broader culture for once to cast a glance, as it were from the top of the tower of Babel, at all the languages of the world, or at least at the chief families of them, the Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian, and to occupy itself, for a brief season, with the question concerning the forms in which the human mind has molded its thoughts for millenniums." To all who respond to this sentiment we can heartily recommend this little guide to the top of the tower; we only wish he could speak English.

The work of Dr. Boltz was an inspiration, and it has the excellencies and some of the faults of that kind of composition. There are nine letters, which treat in succession the whole subject-matter of modern philology. They were written during the dog-days of 1867, in the sweat of the author's brow, not for bread, but for love of man. The hope of the writer was that he might find the form, which would enable him "to awaken in more extensive circles an interest in a science which more than all others is adapted to excite us to recognize our brother in our fellow man, to love him and to march with him in the way of mental and spiritual progress, until (in this sense) there shall be but one flock and one shepherd—universal human love." The letters bear traces of the fever-heat, internal and external, in which they were written; the composition is often careless, and the style occasionally too stilted; but they are any thing but tedious, and there is solid information in them.

On page 28 there is a somewhat ludicrous mistake, which does not look like a typographical blunder. In speaking of the "Code of Gentoo Law," published in London, in 1776, it is called the *Code of the Gentle Law!*

21.—*R. Rothe's Nachgelassene Predigten. Herausgegeben von* Dr. Daniel Schenkel. *IIer Band: Predigten gehalten zu Wittenberg und Heidelberg in den Jahren* 1829–1842. *Nebst einem Anhange, enhaltend die sämmtlichen früher schon gedruckten und von dem Verfasser selbst herausgegebenen Predigten.* (R. Rothe's Posthumous Sermons. Edited by Dr. Daniel Schenkel. Vol. II. Sermons preached in Wittenberg and Heidelberg in the years 1829–1842. Together with an Appendix, containing all the Sermons previously printed and edited by the Author himself.) Elberfeld, 1869. Cincinnati: Philip K. Theobald. 8vo. pp. ii—366.

Predigten von Richard Rothe. Gehalten zu Bonn in den Jahren 1851–1854. *Nach Stenographischen Aufzeichnungen herausgegeben von* Johannes Bleek, *Pfarrer. IIIer Band der Nachgelassenen Predigten.* (Sermons by Richard Rothe. Preached in Bonn in the years 1851–1854. Edited from Stenographic Notes, by the Rev. Johannes Bleek. Vol. III of the Posthumous Sermons.) Elberfeld, 1869. 8vo. pp. viii—382. (Cincinnati: Philip K. Theobald.)

We have already called attention to the first volume of this posthumous edition of Rothe's Sermons. We sought at the same time to give our

readers, so far as it could be done in a few sentences, a general idea of the bent of Rothe's mind, and the character of his work and influence. The publication of the second and third volumes gives us the opportunity of again signalizing the deep piety and wonderful simplicity and sweetness of these sermons. They cover, as we now have them, a period of more than thirty years in the life of one of the profoundest thinkers of the nineteenth century. It may, therefore, be readily supposed that they do not represent a frozen system of thought, in which there was no progress from darkness to light, or from good to better still. If there was one thing which characterized Rothe more than any thing else it was his thirst for truth, and his thorough honesty in uttering it when he was convinced that he had found it. It was this thirst for truth which led him out of the arid and dreary desert of theological dogmatism into that land flowing with the milk and honey of simple faith in the one divine ideal of human life. Rothe began with the traditional dogmas of the Church: the translation of a few paragraphs from one of his sermons will show, more conclusively than any words of ours can do, where he ended. On the fifth Sunday after Trinity, in the year 1857, he preached to the students in Heidelberg on "The Conflict between Belief and Unbelief in Jesus in the Hearts of the Children of our Time." The burden of this, as of all of Rothe's later sermons, was to explain the real nature of faith in Jesus, in the hope that, after he had removed every thing foreign and extraneous, those who had hitherto been repelled would hasten to embrace it.

"In what does the real essence of belief in Jesus consist?" he asks. "What is it to believe *in Jesus;* and what *to believe* in Jesus? The answer is so easy that a child might give it, provided you only do not proceed from preconceived opinions, and that you first of all put yourself in the position of the first believers in Jesus.

"In the first place, What is it to believe *in Jesus?* This can not, one would think, be seriously a matter of doubt. Why, it is to believe in *him, himself,* in his *person—not in any particular representation of him*—in a conception, by means of which it is to be described to the understanding what he is, and in a definite *formula* which expresses this conception in a traditional manner. We do not wish to detract at all from the value of such conceptions and formulas, but yet that must be evident: they are not *Jesus himself,* but only a product of human philosophy relating to him, the work of men, of theologians. To believe in Jesus means to believe in him, himself, in this definite person *pictured to our eyes in the Gospels in a completely defined, accurately delineated, historical image.* To believe in Jesus does not mean to believe in his *offices and titles,* but in his person. And what does that mean: in his person? It means: in the particular *moral character* which shines out toward us from that historical picture—in this definite *inward disposition,* as we read it in that picture, in this particularly constituted *heart,* as it is mirrored there. To believe in the *doctrine* concerning Jesus, in the doctrinal definitions of the Church *about* him, is not to believe in *him,* but rather in the men, the theologians, the Church, who have set up these doctrinal definitions. Is the object of our faith nothing but a pale, shadowy *intellectual image* in our understanding? Is it a *mere* formula, such as: God-man, Son of God and Man, Savior, Reconciler, etc., and not the *living, real, divine-human, holy character, in virtue of which* Jesus is all this, and for which those formulas are only the picture-frame in which it may be the better seen: then it is not, as every child can understand, belief in *him.* That it is not is as certain as that the *real* Jesus is not the *conception* of him, not his *title,* his *office,* but

that which makes him this determinate person, that is, his peculiar character, the holy *inward disposition*, out of which his holy Savior-life proceeded, and this *life* itself, wholly consecrated to the service of his Heavenly Father and of his brethren on earth. He who believes *in this* believes *in Jesus*, whatever his theory concerning Jesus's person and work may be.

"And in the second place: What is *to believe* in Jesus? Certainly not to accept as true, and allow to pass current, a certain representation of him. One may thus believe in a thing or in a formula, but nevermore in a *person*. And here the question is concerning the latter sort of belief. And what it means to believe in a person every one of us knows from daily experience. It means *to put one's confidence in him*, to trust him and submit to him trustfully in love and obedience. Now it is just so with the belief in Jesus. *To put one's confidence in him*, in absolute trust and absolute loving devotion, this is *to believe* in him. And this is just the way in which men believed in him while he was still in the body. Had those who believed in him then, and in this belief adhered to him, any clear and certain *representation* at all of him, of his person, his vocation, let alone *the* perfectly accurate one? No; but they felt themselves in their hearts drawn to him mightily; a voice within them said: Yes, with this Jesus I am at ease in my inmost soul; this is a heart which I can trust *entirely*, to which I can reveal my deepest secrets; I can build upon *his* word in every thing; on *him* I can rely in every condition; pour all my troubles into *his* heart, and lay them upon *his* shoulders; follow *him* absolutely in every path in which he directs and leads me. Whither else could I go? He, and he alone, has words of eternal life! If I only belong to *him*, may call myself *his*, and him *mine*, my master and friend, I feel myself secure for time and eternity. Obeying this voice they confided themselves to him without reserve, and placed themselves wholly at his disposition. And *this* he himself called *believing* in him; and for this very reason this will remain for all time the only true sense of the word.

"But if this is the character of belief in Jesus, how easy it is, my brethren, for *this*, which Jesus calls belief in him, *to be wanting* in one who has the most orthodox *representation* of him in his mind! And, again: how easy for it *to be present* where there is no such representation at all! You can easily picture this to yourselves. Imagine for a moment that the Lord Jesus were to appear again to us now, in the midst of Christendom, but just in the same manner as he did of old, in the form of a servant, in complete incognito, without titles and honors, without official dress, and without the decorations of his Father in Heaven, so that we could see nothing of him, in word or deed, but his holy heart, completely filled with his Heavenly Father, full of pitying love and of resplendent truth. What do you think? Who among the Christians of the present day would recognize him, and cling to him, and who not? I do not wish to anticipate any one's judgment, but, for my part, I am thoroughly of the opinion that very many of those who make orthodox confession of Christ with the greatest volubility would pass by without recognizing him, and without feeling his Divine power of attraction, and this partly for the very reason that they would not discover in him those (for them) conclusive marks, which are given in their dogmatic treatises—as he would certainly seem to them far too worldly. And, on the other hand, how many of those who are unable to adopt the ecclesiastical confession of Christ as their own, would feel themselves drawn to him out of the deepest depths of their heart, would follow his every footstep, would fall in homage at his feet, and would not let him go, and would also inspire in him a corresponding attraction toward them! O yes, how completely different would be then the grouping of human hearts, in their relation to Jesus, from what we should expect from the way in which they call themselves and others 'believers' and 'unbelievers!' And yet this would probably be the most certain test of belief in Jesus. For whoever is *drawn* to the *real* Jesus, not to the *painted* one of theological science, *he* is a believer in Jesus, and only he. He, the Lord Jesus himself, would certainly call these alone believers, for they alone really believe *in him*, *himself;* the rest believe merely in his titles and honors, in his high guardianship in heaven, and in the beautiful presents which he brings with him.

"If, therefore, we only keep clearly in view the true nature of belief in Christ—and this is, moreover, indispensable to every one who wishes to guard against delusions as to his own belief—we shall easily find our position as to the inward conflict of which we speak.

We shall say to our surprise that belief in Jesus is a much more simple matter than we have imagined. We have always thought, who knows how many intellectual operations, and hundreds of investigations of a scientific character, were indispensable to it? Now we see that the essence of the matter consists of nothing of the sort. To have confidence, but perfect confidence in the holy—in the literal sense of the word, Divine character, full of grace and truth, which beams on us so kindly serious from the Jesus of the Gospels, and which shines with ever-increasing clearness out of his whole historic work during these eighteen centuries—to have faith in this character, to resign one's self to him in faithful obedience—that is it. And this is not a complicated task, for upright and simple souls not a difficult one. If you, my brethren, in whom belief in Jesus is struggling with unbelief, once perceive this clearly, you will soon take courage; for you will then see that what you called your unbelief in Jesus is, for the most part, not that at all—that *real* unbelief in Jesus, with you, has its seat in far other places than where you have sought it. You will become conscious then of the real belief in Jesus, already present in you, which you have hitherto not recognized as such, because a false representation of him dazzled your vision—your hitherto *unconscious* Christianity will become *conscious*—you will now call by its *right name* whatever of true piety there is in you, namely, belief in Jesus Christ, and not as you have done, your own virtue and such like—for *every thing* good and noble in you, you will give Jesus the glory, to whom alone it belongs. You will then no longer run the risk of denying what is to you in very deed the holiest and highest for the reason that you do not know its true name. You will then joyfully *confess* Jesus before all the world, because you can do it with complete inward truth, and extend the fraternal hand without reserve to those who have long openly confessed him. But especially will you, when you know what you possess in Jesus, and that what is truly good, whatever name it bear, can flourish within you only through the closest personal adhesion to him, cleave fast to him in confiding love and obedience, and, moreover, to the living, *real* Jesus, and not to the mere profile of a scientific doctrine concerning him. Thus you will bring his holy image, in its every lineament, into ever more distinct relief, until he stands in bodily form before your inward vision, and, eye and heart fixed continually upon it, you resign yourself like a child to all those influences which it will exercise upon you; you will comply with every demand which it excites in your conscience, and thus give proof to yourselves and the world that you *really believe* in Jesus, notwithstanding your *language* concerning him differs from what our forefathers transmitted to us. Thus your belief, your Christianity, will become integral, whole.

"Yes, dear friends, this is what our time has need of. If this could only take place in a large number, if *all* the souls, of whom we have spoken, *were to become conscious of their unconscious Christianity*, then modern Christendom would be healed. This is its fundamental disease—*that they have lost the consciousness of their actual Christianity.* We have no idea that all our true spiritual blessings, both those of the individual and those common to all, are derived from Christ and from him alone; in purblind delusion we complacently regard that as the work of mankind which we possess only in virtue of the effects of that holy vivifying sun which rose upon us in Christ. Oh, if this almost universal delusion were dissipated, if our contemporaries could only become conscious of what they have of Christ, and how he is so very close to them in what they think their own most peculiar possession, how different, wholly different, and how much more beautiful it would be among us! *This* is the only way in which it can be brought about, and it will be brought about in this way, that the Lord Christ shall be again acknowledged and adored, and at large too, in his Christendom. In *this* way let us joyfully hope that a *common, many-voiced*, joyful and cheerful confession of Christ will again be heard among us, be it when it may; and then again will *all* flock to our houses of worship, and, bowing the knee in grateful homage before him, give, as out of one mouth, so also from a single heart, praise, and thanks, and glory to him whose name they bear."

We think this the clearest exposition of *the* vital question in theology that we have ever seen. There is not the slightest doubt as to what Rothe means, and no doubt but he means exactly the right thing.

22.—*Die Person Jesu Christi, von* Dr. Chr. E. Luthardt; *Christenthum und Cultur, von* Julius Disselhoff; *Ueber Schöpfungsgeschichte und Naturwissenschaft, von* Otto Zœckler; *Die Echtheit unsrer Evangelien, von* Const. Tischendorf; *Das Wunder, von* M. Fuchs; *Die Auferstehung Christi, von* Dr. G. Uhlhorn; *Ueber die biblische Versühnungslehre, von* W. F. Gess; *Vernunft, Gewissen und Offenbarung, von* Hermann Cremer: *Die Idee der Vollendung des Reiches Gottes und ihre Bedeutung für das historische Christenthum, von* Prof. J. P. Lange. (*The Person of Jesus Christ, by* Dr. Chr. E. Luthardt; *Christianity and Civilization, by* Julius Disselhoff; *Concerning the History of Creation and Natural Science, by* Otto Zœckler; *The Genuineness of our Gospels, by* Const. Tischendorf; *Miracles, by* M. Fuchs; *The Resurrection of Christ, by* Dr. G. Uhlhorn; *Concerning the Biblical Doctrine of Atonement, by* Dr. W. F. Gess; *Reason, Conscience, and Revelation, by* Hermann Cremer; *The Idea of the Consummation of the Kingdom of God and its Significance for Historical Christianity, by* Prof. J. P. Lange.) Gotha: 1869.

We would call attention to the above series of lectures, issued in pamphlets, averaging about 45 pages each. They embrace, as will be seen, all the great questions which agitate the theological and religious world at the present day. The names of the several authors, some of whom are well known in this country, will be a sufficient guarantee for the religious character of their productions.

We have been particularly struck with the lecture by Prof. Zöckler. It is a powerful tilt at the so-called results of modern scientific investigation in regard to the origin and cause of things. We confess we think the attack would have been more successful if it had been a little less violent. In his zeal to annihilate his opponent with a single broadside the lecturer loaded his guns with every thing that came to hand, filling them to the muzzle and ramming them hard. The *report* was, of course, tremendous; but the gunner forgot that he was fighting in a storm, with the sea running high, and that by pointing directly at the enemy at any given moment he was sure *not* to hit him.

23.—*Siphre Kodesh. Illustrirte Pracht-Bibel für Israeliten. In dem masoritischen Text und neuer deutscher Uebersetzung mit erlauternden Bemerkungen von* Prof. Dr. Julius Fuerst. (*The Illustrated Holy Bible for Israelites. In the Masoretic Text, with a new German Translation and Explanatory Remarks, by* Prof. Dr. Julius Fuerst.) Leipzig and Dresden: 1869.

This is a magnificent work, and should be in the hands of every Biblical student. The Hebrew text is the most beautiful that we have ever seen—a pleasure to look at—the illustrations are first-class; and the notes, whether one always agrees with them or not, are always instructive. The work is to be completed in about fifty numbers, and, when complete, will be an ornament to any library.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

1.—*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie. Gotha:* 1869. *Drittes Heft.*

The current number of the above periodical is mainly taken up with two long articles, the one by Dr. Martensen, Bishop of Seeland, and the other by Dr. J. Köstlin, Professor in Breslau. Seventy-five pages are devoted by the Bishop to a discussion of the time-worn, old yet ever new, question concerning the mutual relations of faith and knowledge, belief and science. And what is the end of the whole matter? Why, a comforting assurance that the discussion will probably never terminate, that there will always be men on both sides confident that they can silence all opposing arguments! The closing sentence we can subscribe to: we give it for the benefit of our "Naturalistic" friends:

"Should any single philosophical system be seriously of the opinion that it has been at length settled by incontrovertible evidence that Naturalism alone is 'science,' and that for all time to come there can be no more mention of *theological* science, or that all theology will very soon come to an end: it may be taken for granted with perfect certainty that such a philosophy will at best resemble the peasant, who, standing on the bank of a river, expected that its waters would soon be exhausted, so that he could pass over dry-shod; the river, however, rolled on, and will continue to roll to eternity.

"*Rusticus exspectat, dum defluat amnis, at ille*
Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum."

The second paper, covering 64 pages, is a continuation of Prof. Köstlin's "Studies Concerning the Moral Law," and treats in an interesting and masterly manner the domain of "the permissible" in ethics, with especial reference to the opinions of Rothe and Wuttke. This is followed by some brief additions which Prof. Diestel makes to his article—mentioned in our last number—on the "Church Estimate of the Old Testament," and this again by a series of excellent notices of current literature.

2.—*Revue Chrétienne. Paris. Juin; Juillet.* 1869.

The June number contains, to the exclusion of nearly every thing else, a long article on "James II and Charles X, an historical comparison of the reign and career of these two monarchs. In the July number there are two valuable and not over-long articles; the one on M. Renan's St. Paul, and the other on "the Religious Value of the Christian Doctrines." M. de Pressensé says of Renan's work that it will be a surprise to no one. It is in perfect harmony with the *Vie de Jésus* and *Les Apôtres*, has the same qualities, the same defects, every-where the same method of procedure for the purpose of embellishing and belittling the great past of the Christian Church:

"The talent of the author has not grown feebler; he always throws a vivid interest over all questions, even the most arid. No one knows better than he how to make erudition piquant. He remains a landscape-painter of the first order for the Orient and Greece; his pictures are of small dimensions, but exquisite."

The reviewer does full justice, we think perhaps a little more than justice, to Renan's learning. He says:

"All the information which general history can afford concerning the state of Roman society, the Judaism of the period of decadence, and the countries traversed by the apostolic missionaries, is really exhausted in this book: numismatics have been laid under contribution with equal ability and learning. The beautiful chapter on Athens at the time at which Paul taught there, will attract especial attention. It is illuminated by that incomparable light which bathes the Parthenon, the reflection of which is never again extinguished in the memory of those who have once contemplated it."

After a thorough review of the critical treatment of the life of Paul at the hand of M. Renan, the writer concludes:

"We are weary of this sugar-coated kind of polemics, which has sharp claws under the velvet which envelops them; for what it takes away is the very substance of religion, its moral foundation. In a word, M. Renan's St. Paul is of equal value with the Jesus which he gave us some years ago. But his method of procedure is better known, and the whole prestige of his talent is not sufficient to insure the success of such prodigious falsifications of the grandest memories of the human race. A few fragments of the Epistles of Paul, admirably translated in the new book of M. Renan, are sufficient to make romance succumb to history. The elegant modern fripperies, which he has tried to patch on to the old cloth, tear away of themselves, and nothing remains but the solid tissue of reality."

Of the second article, by M. Boniface, we can not give an abstract which would do it justice. In order to appreciate it thoroughly the whole article should be read in connection. It is in a certain sense a defense of orthodoxy against the objections of those who wish to substitute for the Christianity of the Bible a "simplified" Christianity, without miracles and without mysteries. The article is a masterly statement of the case as between those who are disposed to attach no importance whatever to the specifically Christian doctrines as such, and those who, though recognizing the human element in the orthodox system, still believe that orthodoxy rests on a true Biblical foundation, and that there can be no Christianity wholly aside from the received dogmas.

The British Quarterly Review. London. July. 1869.

This is an excellent number of the best of the English Quarterlies. Two articles are worthy of special mention: "The Condition of Englishwomen in the Middle Ages," and "The Language of Light." The first of these is highly instructive reading for those who imagine that woman has ever been the victim of oppression and wrong from the "lords of creation." The article shows conclusively that during a period when English civilization was little better than Barbarism, woman was greatly respected, and exerted a powerful influence on the manners and customs of the age. The article on "The Language of Light" is of thrilling interest, and will doubtless attract the attention of scientific men, as well as command the earnest interest of the general reader.

EDITORS' ROUND TABLE.

Faith and Philosophy.—One of the chief difficulties in the way of Christian unity is the fact that theologians do not properly distinguish between Faith and Philosophy. They are not satisfied for us to believe the *facts* of religion; we must accept their *explanation* of these facts. Now, that Christianity has a true philosophy, will not, we presume, be denied by any one. But it is altogether possible for people to be saved who have not the slightest idea what this philosophy is. The faith of the Christian is not *doctrinal*, but *personal*. It is not belief in a dogma, but in a glorious person—one who is "able to save to the uttermost all who come to God by him." Hence the Christian faith is living, earnest, active; not a cold, formal abstraction. It has the power and influence of a personal incarnation, and, as such, impels its possessor to go forward in life's conflicts and make a character in brave and glorious deeds. Philosophy enters upon the explanation of facts; and, while it is possible to reach a right conclusion in reference to all legitimate philosophical questions, it is, nevertheless, true that in the sacred Scriptures the "unity of the faith" is never made to rest upon any such matters—faith in Christ and obedience to his commandments being the only test of fellowship in the Church of Christ.

With this very evident distinction before us, is it not strange that theologians have insisted upon unity where unity is neither possible nor always desirable, and have been little concerned about the only unity we can ever have, or that would be, in any important sense, beneficial? We think it can not successfully be denied that the grounds of alienation and division among the followers of Christ do not relate to faith, but to philosophy—not to facts, but the explanation of facts. To illustrate: men can all unite in the belief of the Bible statement, that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." But this will not satisfy the demands of philosophy. It starts a number of questions which may be important enough in themselves, but should never be made tests of fellowship among Christians. It may be well enough for some minds to consider the *manner* in which the Divine nature was united to the human in Christ; whether he was properly to be called *one* person or two; whether he should be regarded as of *one substance* or of *like substance* with the Father; whether the *deity suffered* at the crucifixion; in what way the sacrifice of Christ was accepted as a *satisfaction* for sin; *why* this sacrifice was *necessary*, etc. But these questions belong to the

schools, not to the *Church;* and if they are to be settled before Christians can have fellowship one with another, then we may as well conclude at once that the prayer of the Savior for unity among his followers will never be answered; for it is simply certain that theologians will never agree concerning these philosophical questions. How much better it would be to discuss these questions, if need be, but hold them *subordinate* to the great law of love, which requires unity only in reference to matters of faith! We think it does not require much reflection to see that the divisions of Christendom have their origin in things that do not necessarily enter into the Christian life.

Our True Position.—Some of our religious friends are still puzzled about our unsectarianism. They are not willing to admit the claim, because we represent, in some sense, a certain religious body. But suppose that religious body which we represent is, in principle and aim, anti-sectarian—what then? If, from the stand-point of Primitive Christianity, we contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and urge all who love the Lord Jesus to unite upon the one foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone—are we not unsectarian, at least as much so as the Word of God requires us to be? It may be that we are, in some respects, unfaithful to this plea—do not support it with legitimate arguments. If so, it would be more in harmony with the spirit of Christ to point out our mistakes than to hide behind the "glittering generalities" of conscious inability to overthrow our position. It would certainly be more like that charity which "thinketh no evil," to "show us a more excellent way," than to deal in the unfruitful denunciations of sectarian vindictiveness. We feel that in pleading for the union of the people of God we are doing the work of Christ; and, to shake our faith in the righteousness of our cause will require something more than the ungainly frowns of a few religious bigots, whose charity is measured by the dimensions of a human creed, and whose sympathy for humanity is largely expended in discussing the difference between *meum* and *tuum*.

A Word with our Exchanges.—We can not close this last number of the first volume of the Quarterly without expressing our heartfelt thanks to many papers and magazines for their favorable notices during the year. We have been met with words of cheer from almost all quarters. The religious and secular press have alike bid us Godspeed. Both in this country and Europe the Quarterly has commanded very general attention. We do not think that this has been chiefly because of the superior ability displayed in its articles. We are rather inclined to think it is because its articles have discussed living issues, and contended for a plea which is rapidly taking possession of the popular heart. *Γενηθήτω φῶς.*

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
441070

BR
1
C5
V.1

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

441070